

JPRS-TAC-86-024

13 March 1986

Worldwide Report

## ARMS CONTROL

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

13 March 1986

## WORLDWIDE REPORT

## ARMS CONTROL

## CONTENTS

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: Need for Peaceful Cooperation in Space Stressed (G. Lomanov; Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 15 Feb 85) .....	1
USSR's Milshteyn, Titov Assess Dangers of SDI (Boris Ivanov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 15 Feb 86) .....	3
TASS: Abrahamson Sent To Enlist Support for SDI (Moscow TASS International Service, 20 Feb 86; Moscow TASS, 20 Feb 86) .....	7
Meets Israeli Minister 'Special Mission' to London .....	7
USSR: U.S. Military-Industrial Complex, SDI Linked (Yu. Kornilov; Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 5 Feb 86) .....	8
IZVESTIYA Hits Threat Posed by SDI Research (L. Koryavin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 3 Feb 86) .....	11
TASS: Perle 'Agitating' for European SDI Role (Moscow TASS International Service, 7 Feb 86) .....	14
PRAVDA: NORAD Agreement Causing Controversy in Canada (V. Shelto; Moscow PRAVDA, 21 Feb 86) .....	16
USSR Academy of Sciences Official Cited on Space Arms (Budapest MTI, 23 Feb 86) .....	17
Canadian Peace Group Coalition Urges Rejection of SDI (Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 12 Feb 86) .....	19

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Moscow: U.S. Military Plans 'Threat to World Peace' (Melor Georgiyevich Sturua; Moscow Domestic Service, 6 Feb 86) .....	20
USSR Raps U.S. 'Arms First, Disarm Later' Policy (Vladlen Kuznetsov; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 4, 3 Feb 86) ....	22
Moscow TV Interviews Paul Warnke on Gorbachev Proposal (Fedor Burlatskiy; Moscow Television Service, 26 Jan 86)	26
USSR Hits Adelman Remarks on Arms Issues (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 23 Feb 86; Moscow Television Service, 21 Feb 86) .....	28
Army Paper Comment, by V. Chernyshev 'Gross Slander', Vitaliy Kobyshev	28 29
IZVESTIYA's Falin Demands 'Substantive' U.S. Response (Valentin Falin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 21 Feb 86) .....	31
USSR: 'Nothing Constructive' in U.S. Response to Proposal (Boris Kalyagin; Moscow Television Service, 23 Feb 86) ...	34
USSR 'International Situation: Questions and Answers' Program (Vladimir Pasko; Moscow Domestic Service, 21 Feb 86) .....	36
USSR's 'Top Priority' Program Discusses Gorbachev Proposal (Radomir Bogdanov, Sergey Plekhanov; Moscow in English to North America, 23 Feb 86) .....	40
PRAVDA Review of Week's International Events (Vitaliy Korionov; Moscow PRAVDA, 23 Feb 86) .....	46
TASS: U.S. Reply to Peace Initiative 'Limited' (Moscow TASS, 24 Feb 86) .....	48
Soviet Peace Committee Chairman Explains Importance of Arms Offer (Moscow Domestic Service, 17 Jan 86) .....	50
USSR Lt Gen Volkogonov Discusses Gorbachev Proposal (Moscow Television Service, 25 Jan 86) .....	52
USSR Weekly Views U.S. Reaction to Gorbachev Plan (A. Arkhipov; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 5, 10 Feb 86) .....	55
TASS: U.S. Dictates FRG Stance on Arms Proposal (Moscow TASS, 21 Feb 86) .....	58



PRAVDA: CSSR's Husak Supports Soviet Arms Proposal (Moscow PRAVDA, 18 Feb 86) .....	60
Moscow TV: Americans Supporting Gorbachev's Proposal Increases (Stanislav Kondrashov; Moscow Television Service, 17 Feb 86)	61
IZVESTIYA Cites U.S. Citizens' Letters to Gorbachev (L. Koryavin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 12 Feb 86) .....	63
USSR Views 'European Aspect' of Gorbachev Proposal (V. Kuzar; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 2 Feb 86) .....	66
USSR Literary Paper Assails NEWSWEEK Article on Arms Proposal (Fedor Burlatskiy; Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 19 Feb 86)	70
Moscow Denies USSR Driving Wedge Between U.S., Allies (Moscow in English in Great Britain and Ireland, 27 Jan 86)	72
USSR: Petrovskiy Book on Nuclear Age, Arms Control Reviewed (A. Ivkin; Moscow PRAVDA, 8 Feb 86) .....	74
USSR's Yuriy Zhukov Comments on Control Struggle (Yuriy Zhukov Interview; London MORNING STAR, 24 Feb 86)...	76
Bovin's Views on Soviet Proposals in Hungarian Paper (Aleksandr Bovin Interview; Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP, 21 Feb 86) .....	78
USSR's Arbatov Outlines Disarmament Policy in Interview (Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO, 24 Feb 86) .....	81
Briefs	
U.S. Responds to Gorbachev Initiative	84
PRAVDA Cites Ceausescu on Gorbachev Statement	84

#### INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

U.S. Urged To Reaffirm Support for Europe's Nuclear Defenses (London SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, 16 Feb 86) .....	85
Briefs	
Labour Party Policy	86

#### NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR Army Paper on U.S. Reluctance To Join Moratorium (V. Lukin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 5 Feb 86) .....	87
USSR Lt Gen Mikhaylov Hits U.S. Development of Nuclear Warheads (K. Mikhaylov; Moscow TRUD, 2 Feb 86) .....	91

USSR Urges 'Practical Step' by U.S. on Arms Testing (Moscow TASS, 21 Feb 86) .....	94
TASS: 'Notorious' U.S. Arms Formula Seeks Superiority (Moscow TASS, 22 Feb 86) .....	95
USSR: U.S. Conducting 'Miniaturized' Nuclear Tests (Moscow PRAVDA, 22 Feb 86) .....	97
TASS: ANZUS 'Disintegrating' Despite U.S. 'Brazen Pressure' (Moscow TASS, 30 Jan 86) .....	98
IZVESTIYA Editorial Article Views U.S. Attitude on Test Ban (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 23 Feb 86) .....	100
Moscow on New U.S. Ambassador's Remarks on Nordic NFZ (Aleksandr Gorbunov; Moscow International Service, 23 Jan 86) .....	104

#### RELATED ISSUES

Canadian Commons Committee Issues Report on NORAD Renewal (Joe O'Donnell; Toronto THE SATURDAY STAR, 15 Feb 86) ....	106
---	-----

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### USSR: NEED FOR PEACEFUL COOPERATION IN SPACE STRESSED

PM181429 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 15 Feb 86 p 3

[Report by special correspondent G. Lomanov: "Space for Peace. Reportage from the 27th CPSU Congress Press Center"]

[Text] A map of Venus made up of photographs taken by Soviet unmanned satellites, so detailed and clear, as if our neighbor in the solar system was not wrapped in a thick blanket of clouds at all...

Mysterious "black holes" in the remote depths of the universe homed in on by X-ray and gamma-ray telescopes operating on extraterrestrial observatories...

The latest news about the flight of the "Vega" satellites heading for Halley's Comet ...

Soviet and foreign journalists saw and heard all this at a meeting with eminent Soviet scientists at the 27th CPSU Congress press center. There is great interest in the forthcoming party congress -- accreditation began only recently, yet over 2,300 mass media representatives have gone through the procedure and applications are still coming in from abroad.

The press conference was devoted to a very important present-day problem -- international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space. It was attended by V.N. Ignatenko, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Information Department; Academician R.Z. Sagdeyev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Space Research; three times Hero of Socialist Labor Academician Ya. B. Zeldovich, and other scientists.

"Space technology offers science unprecedented opportunities," Academician R. Sagdeyev noted. "The results of research in that sphere are becoming available to the whole of mankind. And scientists are now faced with a moral problem -- to work for the benefit of mankind or participate in the so-called 'Strategic Defense Initiative,' which represents an enormous danger to the world."

The speakers talked of the large-scale peaceful space projects in which scientific collectives from various countries are participating; they answered numerous journalists' questions. And, of course, they included the following question -- will Soviet and U.S. cosmonauts be operating together, as they did during the flight by the "Soyuz" and "Apollo" craft? Answering it, the experts pointed out that the USSR was not to blame for the cancellation of plans for joint Soviet-American expeditions. But the Geneva

meeting has already produced the first results in strengthening scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and the United States -- draft joint programs for the provision of computers for schools and research into thermonuclear fusion. It is also hoped that major space projects will be resumed.

Is a flight to Mars by an international crew a realistic prospect? Answering the question, Academician R.Z. Sagdeyev said:

"Preliminary calculations show that such an expedition is within the bounds of modern technology. Although some very complex problems have to be tackled relating to crew safety -- after all, they would have to cover an enormous distance; the earth would be a long way away and it would be difficult to expect any assistance from that quarter. Obviously, such a project would only become possible at the turn of the century, and in the next few years it would be desirable to reconnoiter using automatic vehicles."

The "Phobos" project that was recently described in our paper can be regarded as an example of this kind of reconnaissance flight. Scientists and engineers from more than 10 countries intend to participate in the project. All the speakers stressed the special topical significance of international collaboration among researchers in the peaceful study of space in view of the fact that the United States is attempting to militarize near-earth space and turn it into a bridgehead for a show of strength. It was noted that the implementation of the "star wars" program would have extremely dangerous consequences and would undermine the peoples' hopes for an end to the arms race.

As is known, in our country cosmonautics has long been a loyal servant not only of science, but of national economic practice and has made a real economic impact. But abroad of late they have been making increasing use of the term "spin-off," attempting to deck out in civvies a purely military project. The supporters of SDI claim that the implementation of the program will pay dividends in terms of civilian needs, and useful technology will appear which, when implemented, will recoup all the expenditure. Is this so?

"Such arguments by propagandists of SDI seem very odd to me," Academician R.Z. Sagdeyev said, answering a question by your SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA correspondent. "Yes, research in the context of this program can result in spin-offs. But why take the crooked path, when there is a direct route?

To deliver mankind from the threat of nuclear disaster, there is the extensive, realistic program for the elimination of mass destruction weapons put forward by our country. And to develop science and technology -- is it sensible to rely on the "by-products" of a military project when there are many problems common to mankind and bold designs which can only be implemented through common efforts: environmental conservation, elimination of famine, eradication of disease, and, of course, space exploration."

"The 20th century is an age of flourishing scientific thought, and science is essentially international," Academician Ya. B. Zeldovich noted in his speech. "It is playing a prominent part in eliminating distrust between peoples and in generating an atmosphere of cooperation."

The Soviet scientists at the press conference clearly stated their position: Science and international collaboration among researchers in different countries must serve the cause of peace and benefit all the peoples of the world.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1272

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### USSR'S MILSHEYN, TITOV ASSESS DANGERS OF SDI

PM181030 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Special correspondent Boris Ivanov report on "discussion" between Lieutenant General German Titov, USSR pilot-cosmonaut, and Professor Mikhail Milshteyn, "eminent Soviet expert and author of numerous works on U.S. military strategy": "'Challenger' and 'Star Wars'" -- first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The tragedy that occurred recently at Cape Canaveral during the launch of the shuttle Challenger shook not only the Americans. People all over the world, including in our country, shared the sorrow felt in the United States in connection with the death of the seven astronauts. At the same time, this tragedy posed many questions for the Americans. Even though U.S. public opinion knows only the barest details of the program for the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike weapons -- only what the Pentagon allows to be known -- nevertheless the recent tragedy forced many to ask themselves: Where is the United States going with the "star wars" space program? Can equipment be trusted when mankind's very existence is at stake? Isaac Asimov, the well-known U.S. science fiction writer, said: Equipment cannot be trusted. And if the SDI is actually created [budet sozdana], the end result of one single error will be the death of not just seven persons but the whole of mankind. Such is the cost of errors.

Editorial Board: How are I. Asimov's words to be assessed? Is this an isolated opinion? Or are these words indicative of the more profound and more serious thoughts and anxieties of ordinary people and specialists both in America itself and in other countries?

Milshteyn: In order to answer this question it is necessary to make an objective evaluation of the events at Cape Canaveral from a technical viewpoint.

First, this was by no means the first launch of this type of spacecraft. All the previous flights seem to have accustomed Americans to the idea that the craft was absolutely reliable, 100 percent reliable -- foolproof, as they themselves say.

This in fact explains why the crew included purely civilian members, and I have in mind the teacher McAuliffe. Nevertheless, despite numerous checks [proverka] of the craft before launching, and after all chances of a breakdown appeared to have been ruled out, the disaster did occur. Yet the SDI system is not subject to checks [proverka]. No matter how long it may take to create [sozdavat], no matter how painstakingly it may be improved, it will never be capable of being tried out [proverena]. A try-out [proverka] means war.



Second, no defect at all was detected by any of the monitoring facilities, any of the automatic equipment at NASA's disposal, or any of the electronic instruments with which Challenger was crammed. It is still not clear what actually happened to the craft and what caused the explosion.

Third, at some stage the crew and all its systems are in the hands of the computer. No one can interfere with the electronic operations at that moment. The electronic system obeys its own program. Bear in mind that we are talking about one single craft. And this, let me emphasize, is one craft whose launch was preceded by routine preparations. What can be said about the reliability of SDI which, as the Americans perceive it, involves a multiplicity of most complex systems and is due to come into operation under extraordinary circumstances, when there is simply no time to check [na proverku] doubtful situations and detect possible faults.

U.S. specialists, particularly members of the Union of Concerned Scientists and the Federation of American Scientists, note that the SDI system would be far more complex than Challenger, and therefore technical errors would be that much more inevitable. Any one of these errors, and I. Asimov is absolutely right, could be the last.

Editorial Board: How many parts and components make up the SDI system?

Titov: Given that a spacecraft contains millions of parts, the SDI, which is already a system, contains billions of parts.

Editorial Board: How large is the number of possible faults, given the existence of so many parts?

Titov: The more elements a system has, the greater the probability of failure. There is no disputing this fact. Anyone with just basic engineering training knows that there is no such thing as units of reliability, which means that there can be no such thing as absolutely reliable systems.

Editorial Board: The champions of SDI in Washington claim that the system which they are creating [sozdat] or attempting to create will be controlled by superintelligent and super-reliable computers, which would rule out any breakdowns.

Titov: Yes, in parallel with the "Strategic Defense Initiative" the Americans are also implementing the so-called "computer initiative." Work on fifth-generation computers is underway in the United States. But even they do not guarantee 100-percent reliability. Even if only because the intelligence of any machine, any automated system, any one of the most modern computers is as great as that which man, their creator, has built into them. Is any man -- and therefore any machine -- capable of foreseeing every possible situation? This is impossible.

Editorial Board: Errors by U.S. warning systems have on many occasions in the past brought the world to the brink of catastrophe. Let us recall the occasions when either flights of wild geese were mistaken for missiles or magnetic storms were the causes of false alarms.

Fortunately, hitherto there has been enough time to evaluate the situation, detect errors, and prevent the irreversible. Will there be time for this under SBI conditions?

Titov: The point is that it is still possible to forecast magnetic storms. Serious thought must be given to something else, however. Today, in addition to the several hundred artificial satellites orbiting the earth in different orbits, there are 5,000 other diverse objects such as defunct satellites and the last stages of launch vehicles, all kinds of space fragments and debris, and who knows what else. Where is the guarantee that SBI, no matter how high a level may be reached by technology, will "interpret" the incredible multiplicity of alternatives that may arise in this connection. It is difficult to say what will happen in space in the event of some emergency situation. But this will be a catastrophe for Earth, for our own planet.

Milshteyn: In other words, the fatal danger for all of mankind -- the danger of a nuclear war being accidentally started -- increases many times. This danger always exists, but while there are no provocative systems like SBI it can still be controlled. The "Strategic Defense Initiative" leads to strategic chaos. The effect of all existing accords is reduced to zero, and the entire meaning of everything that the Americans themselves describe as stability is diluted. G. Keyworth, who was science adviser to President Reagan, published an article, a kind of "political testament," prior to his departure from office. This article was the first to say aloud that the purpose of SBI is not to create [sordat] "an antinuclear umbrella" over the United States, but to deploy "a nuclear cowl" over the Soviet Union. In other words, to keep our country constantly in its sights.

Titov: The Americans write that these are instantaneous action weapons, and any decision to activate nuclear missiles stationed in space must be made very quickly. Within 100-300 seconds, to be precise. It is impossible within those few moments to analyze what is likely to happen and to report to the country's political leadership. The decisions will be made by robots. On behalf of all mankind. The very first error, the very first breakdown -- and nothing and no one will be any longer in a position to prevent the catastrophe. This is why all of the White House' assurances about SBI's high degree of reliability are irresponsible and aimed at naive people.

Milshteyn: Unfortunately, it has to be admitted that, judging by incoming reports, the U.S. Administration has learned nothing from the Challenger disaster. What is happening is diametrically opposite to what would seem to be the dictates of common sense. Calls to accelerate work on SBI are openly heard. The Pentagon reacted to the disaster in an altogether highly peculiar fashion. It is using all means to accelerate preparations for the next flights, which will be for purely military purposes. Special boosters have been ordered. Appropriations for the "Strategic Defense Initiative" have increased by 75 percent. To a certain extent the administration's reaction to the Challenger disaster cannot be described as anything but blasphemous.

The involvement of West European countries in the elaboration of the SBI program has been stepped up. Furthermore, there is nothing but technological imperialism behind all the talk about desiring to create [sordavat] SBI technology jointly with the allies. Washington is pursuing a triple goal here. First, to involve the best scientific minds in Europe and Japan in its own military programs. Second, to ensure the inflow of material resources into the United States. And finally, to render the West Europeans' participation in SBI irreversible and to drag them firmly into its military schemes.

Editorial Board: We cannot say that the Soviet Union and the United States trust one another. At present, however, there are no space missile platforms with strike weapons on board. If they were to appear, what would be the effect on relations between our countries?

Milshteyn: The first "victims" of the implementation of the "star wars" program will be the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva and all the treaties -- primarily the ABM Treaty -- without which the process of disarmament and of curbing the arms race is simply impossible. It is impossible since they are based on the principle of equality and equal security for the sides. And these are the actual principles that are infringed by SDI. The essence of SDI is to attain military superiority over the USSR. The entire incipient process of normalization between us and the United States will be disrupted. Preventing the transfer of the arms race to space is an absolute condition for fruitful talks about terminating it on earth.

Titov: The actual idea of nuclear disarmament, which the Americans verbally support, will suffer. They have not ceased to claim that the creation [sozdaniye] of SDI is necessary "in order to eliminate the nuclear threat altogether." There is, however, a much more sensible -- the only sensible -- way: to eliminate nuclear weapons as proposed in M.S. Gorbachev's statement.

Editorial Board: The White House accompanies its advertising of "star wars" with the thesis that, following the creation [sozdaniye] of SDI, the United States would supposedly share its technological secrets with other countries. On the basis of previous experience, is such "generosity" likely?

Titov: These are empty words. If Washington has gone so far as transforming gas pipelines into weapons, is it likely to share with anyone technology which promises it military superiority? I am convinced that this is out of the question. Washington's propaganda tricks pursue a single goal -- to mislead public opinion.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1272



SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: ABRAHAMSON SENT TO ENLIST SUPPORT FOR SDI

Meets Israeli Minister

LD202327 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Kuwait, 20 Feb (TASS) -- Lieutenant General James Abrahamson, director of the Strategic Defense Initiative organization, who has arrived in Israel to take part in U.S.-Israeli talks on cooperation in the "star wars" program, has said that Israel may "make a significant contribution to the SDI program."

Reporting this, the Kuwaiti news agency KUNA notes that the head of the U.S. delegation made this statement after meeting with Gid'on Pat, the minister of science and development, and other officials with whom he discussed details of the U.S.-Israeli treaty on SDI cooperation. It is planned to sign this document, KUNA points out, this March in Washington.

'Special Mission' to London

LD202119 Moscow TASS in English 2105 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 20 TASS -- According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the U.S. Administration has sent Lt. Gen. James Abrahamson, head of the U.S. office in charge of implementing the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," to London on a special mission. His main task is to enlist British scientists and manufacturers in carrying out the American "star wars" program. While in the British capital, Abrahamson held a briefing behind closed doors to which hundreds of people were invited. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the briefing "is the first such classified session held in Europe."

/9604

C. O: 5200/1272

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S. MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX, SDI LINKED

PM061453 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 5 Feb 86 p 3

[Article by Yu. Kornilov: "The Opponents of Geneva"]

[Text] The wide-ranging major new foreign policy initiatives put forward in M.S. Gorbachev's statement continue to produce the most widespread positive response throughout the world. Prominent politicians and public figures and the press in various countries are stressing over and over again that the statement by the Soviet leader is a document which marks a milestone in the USSR's consistent struggle for the preservation and consolidation of peace.

At the same time, analyzing the stream of reactions to the USSR's new proposals and steps, you cannot fail also to notice something else: The Soviet "peace offensive" clearly does not please those circles in the West, and primarily in the United States, whose policy is geared to continued, forced material preparations for war, rather than to prospects for reviving and strengthening detente. Speeches aimed essentially at downgrading the significance of the Soviet initiatives, distorting their meaning, and cancelling out what has been achieved in Geneva ring out in Washington.

Paying lip service to "arms control," Washington is, at the same time, unwilling to give up its plans for the creation [sozdaniye] testing, and deployment of space strike weapons, although it is more than obvious that it is the "star wars" program which constitutes the main obstacle on the path to delivering mankind from the threat of nuclear self-destruction. Although the U.S. nuclear arsenals are chockablock, the military production lines are being speeded up: Let me recall that the Pentagon budget for fiscal 1986 totals almost \$300 billion--a record level in the country's history--and that the secret Pentagon "directives for the defense sphere for fiscals 1985-1989" make provision for spending \$1,958.6 billion on the buildup of U.S. military might.

Who generates militarism in the United States?

It is known that 50 percent of the U.S. industrial potential is in the hands of members of the "500 club" (this is how the country's 500 biggest corporations refer to themselves). The process of concentration and

centralization of capital which is particularly rampant in the U.S. military industry, has produced a situation where a dominant role is played by 100 supergiants which in 1965-1985 accounted for 65-70 percent of the total cost of military orders (with 10 of the biggest arms producers accounting for up to 35 percent). In all, 30,000 main contractors and 50,000 subcontractors implement the Pentagon's orders. More than 250 universities and colleges are involved in work of a military nature, and one-third of all scientists and engineering developers engage in military research. The U.S. military industry which, according to the WASHINGTON POST employs more than 6 million people, is the biggest in the world both in respect to the number of enterprises and the volume of production; the United States accounts for more than three-fourths of the total production of aviation and missile equipment, approximately one-half of the production of artillery weapons, and more than two-thirds of warships of all the NATO countries taken together. The capitalist world's most highly developed state has turned into a state with the most militarized and worst deformed economy. Boeing, the aviation and space technology company which specializes in the production of military aircraft, helicopters, and missile and space technology, occupies one of the top places on the "500 club" list. General Dynamics, the military-industrial corporation which supplies missiles, aircraft, submarines, and diverse radioelectronic equipment to the Pentagon, is in the same league. And then there is the powerful General Electric Corporation which builds missile cruisers in particular and plays an important role in Washington's "star wars" plans.

A special place in the implementation of the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] program is occupied by Californian military-industrial corporations at present. These corporations implement more than one-fourth of all the Pentagon's orders and produce more than 40 percent of the weapons which make up the country's nuclear arsenal; 44.7 percent of the Pentagon's orders connected with "star wars" preparations go to the Californian military concerns.

It is no secret that in the late 70s it was in particular the Californian and other military-industrial giants which--displaying particular zeal and sparing no means or effort--paved the way to Washington's political Olympus for many prominent representatives of the Republican administration. Now many ranking officials in Washington play an active role as lobbyists for the companies and concerns which promoted their career. Thus, M. Kampelman, the head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva--according to INFORMATION BULLETIN--unofficially represents the Lockheed concern and is constantly to-ing and fro-ing between Washington and Geneva in an effort to secure the greatest possible share of the fat orders in connection with the "star wars" program. Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle, a former aide to H. Jackson, the extreme right-wing "Senator from Boeing" and one of the founders of the diehard reactionary organization "Committee on the Present Danger," lobbies for Boeing. More such examples could easily be cited.

The military-industrial corporations which are engaged in the implementation of SDI and which have very close ties with official Washington bring great pressure to bear on the U.S. Congress. According to a report published in Washington by the public organization "Center on Budget and Policy Priorities," just 18 of the Pentagon's biggest contractors which participate in the MX ICBM production program and in the development [razrabotka] of "star wars" weapons have contributed \$2.3 million in influential congressmen's election campaigns over the past 2 years. Almost 95 percent of the contracts for so-called "space weapons" have been distributed among enterprises located in California, Washington, Texas, Alabama, and Massachusetts, while senators representing 4 of these 5 states in the U.S. Congress are on the Senate Armed Services Committee. It is also characteristic that 77 percent of the contracts for research and development work [nauchno-issledovatel'skiye raboty] under the SDI program have been distributed in constituencies whose representatives in the Congress are on the Armed Services or Appropriations Committees.

"Officials, politicians, and administrators operate hand in glove in the United States," the West German DER SPIEGEL magazine notes. "Companies and state authorities are so closely interlaced that the new military program is acquiring a dynamism of its own. Senators and congressmen from individual states take care that everything runs smoothly because arms investments are simultaneously an instrument of regional policy. As a result, the military-industrial lobby is acquiring additional strength when applying pressure to the government."

Will the U.S. military-industrial complex succeed in thwarting the process of improving Soviet-American relations which has begun, will it prevail over the forces of reason and common sense? Will the words about love of peace proclaimed from high rostrums in Washington continue to serve as a cover for gambling on strength and preparing for war?

The U.S. Administration will have to make responsible decisions if it wants to break with the logic of confrontation and nuclear arms race which is being foisted on it by the military-industrial complex. The future of human civilization must not be subordinated to corporations' profits.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1272

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### IZVESTIYA HITS THREAT POSED BY SDI RESEARCH

PM051417 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Second, final part of own correspondent L. Koryavin "Letters From California": "Image of Life and Death"]

[Excerpt] San Francisco-Los Angeles-Washington--I talked with Joseph Anderson, vice president of the Bechtel Corporation. Bechtel is a concern which carries out construction contracts, including the construction of American military bases. It has produced two of the present American leaders--Defense Secretary Weinberger and Secretary of State Shultz. Anderson worked with the latter for several years in California. After paying tribute to his own state as being "most highly developed," he moved on to the theme of SDI. Anderson's judgements coincided fully with what his former Bechtel colleagues are saying in Washington today: The United States needs SDI for "purely defensive" purposes, it is at the "research" stage, the components of "star wars" are not offensive weapons and are not aimed against human life but are "just weapons which knock out weapons."

Such "concepts" are designed for naive people, to put it mildly. They are part of the propaganda screen behind which the military-industrial complex and its "plenipotentiaries" in the institutions of U.S. state power, and in the Pentagon above all, are trying to conceal the creation [sozdaniye] of arsenals of offensive weapons. The space "hawks"--the physicist Keller and General Graham--do not hide the fact that they are seeking U.S. military superiority, and they call the antisatellite system, lasers, and other armaments which they are creating [sozdavat] the "favorite" of the Western military alliance.

You do not need the mind of a strategist to realize that space-based means can equally be aimed both at targets in earth orbit and at targets on the earth itself. They can equally threaten both military and peaceful targets. There is no doubt that these weapons pose a deadly danger to all mankind. Competent specialists and scientists, including some in the United States itself, long ago arrived at this opinion.

They rightly say that it is one step from "research" work to the production of weapons, and even less of a step from creation [sozdaniye] to deployment. Without resorting to historical parallels, let us nonetheless recall



that "Metallforschung"--the so-called "society for metal research"--existed in Germany before World War II. Concealed behind that signboard was an industrial and financial association engaged on updating the German war machine's artillery pool. In the end, the metal being "researched" was cast into gun barrels which brought death to millions of people. Also in Germany mortars were produced in "agricultural machinery plants," and the "brains center" where the plans to build the submarine fleet were drawn up was called a "higher technical school" and was passed off as a modest "scientific laboratory."

The "star wars" ideologues advance the "thesis" that space weapons will be so sophisticated that on their creation [sozdaniye] weapons as such will "die out" altogether, that is, they propose the way to disarmament and the prevention of war only through superarmament in space. And this "argument" is steeped in falsehood from start to finish. Let us turn again to history. When Nobel invented dynamite, he too put his trust in its destructive power and believed that, given the presence of such weapons in the world, no one would dare to unleash war. With the invention of the internal combustion engine and its installation in military machines, people also believed that the "improvement" would curb lovers of military adventures. Finally, nuclear weapons and "nuclear blackmail." What did the path to "nuclear superiority" begin with? With the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the deaths of hundreds of thousands of peaceful people. Let us remember what all these "military improvements" from which the strategists of the "space shield" are taking over the baton today, cost mankind.

Space weapons, which are now coming off the drawing boards at the Livermore research center and onto mockup tables and ranges and are being passed from the hands of scientists to the hands of military maniacs, pose new threats to mankind, particularly as the "star wars" weapons are no longer associated today with Livermore or the Los Alamos laboratory but also with Edwards Air Force Base, where the ASAT antisatellite system is being tested, and with the White Sands range in the New Mexico desert, where the laser radiation beam of the Nova installation strikes by direct laying. These are approaches to a practical twist in the space arms race spiral.

The danger of space weapons lies in the fact that they are organically linked with nuclear weapons. Therefore, in accelerating the creation [sozdaniye] of these weapons, the United States is continuing to conduct nuclear explosions, as specialists point out, for "pumping" the lasers being created [sozdavat] under the "star wars" program. Many of the people with whom I spoke in California pointed out that this precisely is one of the reasons why the United States rejected the Soviet proposal to introduce a moratorium on nuclear explosions. They also emphasized that it was precisely the military-industrial complex that was opposed to Soviet-American accords and demanded that the administration "not back down a single step in Geneva" from the plans for the militarization of space.

Journalists noticed that a new motif was inscribed on the fuselage of the F-15 aircraft used to launch the ASAT system--the silhouette of an aircraft aimed at a point located in orbit. This is the emblem of a new branch of the U.S. Armed Forces--the space forces. Their command has already been set up with its headquarters at Colorado Springs, they are being manned with personnel, and their strike potential is being actively prepared. The new emblem will be displayed on missiles, interceptor satellites, laser devices, and shuttle spacecraft.

These are the "defensive" means which the Pentagon is planning to launch into earth orbit. These are the programs which are already being put on the conveyor belts of the U.S. military-industrial complex. Its concerns regard the idea of "star wars," above all, as a most profitable huge undertaking, as "pennies from heaven."

/9604

CSO: 3200/1272

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### TASS: PERLE 'AGITATING' FOR EUROPEAN SDI ROLE

LD081516 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1620 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 7 Feb (TASS)--TASS commentator Yevgeniy Yegorov writes:

There are many "superhawks" in the Pentagon, but Richard Perle undoubtedly takes the cake, if one does not count Secretary Caspar Weinberger himself. His place in the Pentagon hierarchy--assistant secretary of defense (International Security Policy)--is not all that important. But he has great influence, since his militaristic and anti-Soviet views fully coincide with his patron Weinberger's point of view. And yet another source of Perle's influence are his close links with the military-industrial complex. It was not in vain that he was for several years assistant to the now deceased Senator Henry Jackson, who was called the "Boeing Senator."

Until recently, Perle "specialized" in the struggle against such basic Soviet-American agreements on arms control as SALT-II and the ABM treaty. Now his favorite hobby horse is the "Strategic Defense Initiative." It is hard to name a large city in the United States or a country in Western Europe where this "star wars knight" has not been, agitating for this mad militaristic venture. At the same time, he tirelessly slings mud on those who dare to come out against SDI.

Perle's last target was the British Labor Party. As is known, this political party comes out against the nuclear rearmament of Britain, U.S. nuclear bases on its territory, for the withdrawal of U.S. cruise missiles, and, of course, against SDI. The laborites warn that they oppose the agreement concluded with the United States on the participation of British firms in SDI development. This simply enraged Perle. Speaking at the London-based International Institute of Strategic Studies, he poured acid criticism on the members of the Labor Party, and accused them of "progressive unilateralism." In his words, the laborites have an "almost unique ability to introduce conflicts and to destroy the Atlantic alliance."

The labor shadow minister of foreign affairs, Dennis Healey, gave a good rebuff to Perle, saying that Perle has perhaps done more than anyone else to undermine European support of NATO.



Perle, incidentally, is at present not the only American "bull" in the West European "china shop." John Whitehead, first deputy U.S. secretary of state, has now appeared in Brussels, where he spoke at a conference, "Technology and Security of the West," and openly declared that the "United States is waiting for West Europe to follow the example of the FRG and Great Britain" and take part in the developments on the "star wars" programs. In other words, pressure is being applied from all sides.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1272

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA: NORAD AGREEMENT CAUSING CONTROVERSY IN CANADA

PM240951 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Shelkov dispatch: "The Trojan Horse"]

[Text] Ottawa, 20 Feb--As spring approaches--the time when the agreement between Canada and the United States on the Joint North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) is to be extended for another 5-year period--the controversy around this agreement is heating up. It is conducted by influential representatives of Canadian political parties, organizations championing peace, and journalists.

A few days ago a report of the parliamentary standing committee on foreign affairs and national defense was published in the Canadian capital that recommends that legislators agree to the extension of the agreement "without substantial changes." This appeal has pleased the Pentagon generals.

However, in Canada itself, this document has immediately attracted sharp criticism. Representatives of the Liberal Party, while supporting the standing committee's recommendations in general, have called for the inclusion in the agreement of a previously dropped paragraph about the inadmissibility of the utilization of the joint command in the strategic missile defense system. Without this stipulation NORAD may find itself drawn into the "star wars" program, J. Chretien, a spokesman for the Liberal Party, has declared. A similar view was expressed by P. Jewett, speaking on behalf of the New Democratic Party. She declared that if the aforementioned reservation was not included in the new agreement, NORAD may prove a "Trojan horse" for the Canadians in respect to "star wars."

/9604

CSO: 5200/1272

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OFFICIAL CITED ON SPACE ARMS

LD231923 Budapest MTI in English 1736 GMT 23 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 23 (MTI) -- Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice-chairman of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union and president of the movement "Scientists Against Nuclear Danger", and one of the developers of the Soviet programme for accelerating scientific-technical progress, gave an interview of MTI's Moscow correspondent about the role and tasks of science in realizing this programme, and the connections between science and disarmament.

Velikhov said that the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will determine the new directions of progress and will thus, in certain respects, offer a breakthrough in setting the national economy on the course of intensive development, in streamlining the management system. The aim is to increase national income, improve productivity and accelerate socio-economic development. The task of scientists in this is to apply the existing scientific knowledge, the new technological procedures in national economy, and to gather further experiences as soon as possible. In this relation Velikhov mentioned that scientific centres have recently been established to research, among others, laser technologies, computer engineering, the application of fibre-optics, and biotechnology. The other, similarly important task is to develop basic researches and microelectronics.

In answer to a question Velikhov said that the growth of the country's economic strength is in direct relation to the defence capability. "We are forced to spend certain sums on defence. We try to reduce these loads to the lowest level possible. Mikhail Gorbachev's new proposals are aimed at reducing our expenditures turned to these aims to a minimum", he said.

The disarmament programme included in the Gorbachev proposal raises a whole line of major scientific tasks, the solving of which become extremely important particularly in the final stage of its realization, when it must be ensured that the entire arms reduction process be balanced and precisely controllable throughout. This area offers the best possibilities for cooperation between scientists of the world. Such cooperation is, to a certain extent, already in progress, for example with American scientists", [quotation marks as received] Velikhov added.

In answer to a question about the probable results of the next Gorbachev-Reagan meeting, Velikhov expressed his hope that "common sense will prevail in the end". He pointed out: It is vital to come to understand that security is only possible on mutual basis.

He set forth his opinion that a perfectly reliable, extremely complex space weapons system cannot be established, however, it is very easy to destroy such a system. Such systems do not have genuine advantages, the United States will not find itself in a genuinely superior position in this way. There stands against the defense system a weapon which is relatively simple and can be easily reproduced. It is impossible to establish an effective defence against this attack system, and even more impossible to try it out "live".

In connection with international cooperation in nuclear research for peaceful aims, Velikhov said: Irrespective of the disarmament programme, and parallel to it, we make numerous cooperation proposals, including the field of thermonuclear research. If effective control over fissile materials would be realized under the disarmament program, new areas would open up to research. Many research programs would become more simple, as today many programs are secret because of defence considerations. Eliminating the restrictions would be very useful from the point of view of nuclear research for peaceful aims.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1272

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### CANADIAN PEACE GROUP COALITION URGES REJECTION OF SDI

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 12 Feb 86 p A3

[Text] OTTAWA

A nation-wide coalition of peace groups is urging the Mulroney Government to reject "unambiguously" any Canadian involvement in the U.S. Star Wars anti-missile defence plan.

Peace coalition spokesmen, appearing in Ottawa at one of several news conferences held across the country yesterday, maintained there is no reason to fear an increasing Canadian complicity in Star Wars.

The peace groups see a possible connection between the U.S. Space Command and Norad, U.S. and Canadian defence offi-

cials have denied there is any link between Norad and research or planning for Star Wars, officially known as strategic defence initiative. They say nobody can be sure at this stage how the research into non-nuclear ground- or space-based missile killers will turn out.

As research proceeds, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark has urged the superpowers to comply strictly with the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which limits the development, testing and deployment of intercontinental missile defence systems or their components.

/12851

C50: 5220/29

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### MOSCOW: U.S. MILITARY PLANS 'THREAT TO WORLD PEACE'

LDO61542 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 6 Feb 86

[From the "Time, Events, People" program: commentary by IZVESTIYA international observer Melor Georgiyevich Sturua: "The Military-Industrial Complex of the United States--A Threat to Universal Peace"]

[Excerpts] The world public continues to discuss Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement of 15 January with enormous interest. The statement addresses the most burning questions of modern times: How is man to be protected from a nuclear missile disaster? How is his most cherished dream to be realized--the dream of a world without war or weapons?

While the overwhelming majority of the international public supports and endorses this statement from the Soviet leader, aggressive circles in the West, and primarily the U.S. military-industrial complex, come out against it. Why? An explanation of this may be provided by the answer to another question: What is the military-industrial complex?

When President Eisenhower coined the term "military-industrial complex," the Pentagon's budget stood at only \$43 billion. The draft U.S. military budget for 1986 is \$313.7 billion. With the coming to power of Reagan's Republican administration, the influence of the U.S. military-industrial complex grew even more. At the same time, the threat to peace and international security from U.S. militarism, from nuclear maniacs crazy about world domination, increased still further.

A qualitatively new situation came into being after President Reagan introduced on 23 March 1983, the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, which was almost immediately nicknamed the "Star Wars" program. The plans announced by Washington concerning space are the most militarist of all the doctrines generated by the military-industrial complex. It is certainly not fortuitous that representatives of the military monopolies engaged in the production of "Star Wars" weapons described the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva as ominous. Yes, what is good for peace is bad for the military-industrial complex, and vice versa.

The Pentagon's budget for the 1986 fiscal year and its long-term guidelines right up to the start of the third millennium show convincingly that the

Strategic Defense Initiative does not exclude, but actually presupposes the even more intensive production and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of offensive weapons--the so-called first-strike or strategic weapons. Yes, the world is faced with an unprecedented build-up of U.S. strategic nuclear arsenals. There is the production of the MX and the Midgetman intercontinental ballistic missiles, the deployment [razvertyvaniye] in Europe of Pershing-II missiles, the building of B-1 bombers and, shortly, the development [razrabotka] and production of Stealth bombers, long-range cruise missiles and Trident-II missiles for new submarines.

When proposing all these programs, U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger did not even bother to disguise their true purpose--a sharp increase in the capability of the United States' Armed Forces to deliver a nuclear first strike. It is these weapons that must be given a space shield. As was cynically acknowledged by Colonel Jack Lousma, a space shuttle commander, one can intimidate the whole world from space. Over the next few years, "Star Wars" expenditure will be tripled. In the not-too-distant future, it will pass the trillion dollar mark, according to Senator Proxmire. And one Washington journalist figuratively and sarcastically observed that, as before, the budgets have marched off toward the Capitol with a clearly military bearing. The sound of this marching has a threatening effect throughout the world. It brings our world closer to an unprecedented catastrophe. It must be halted. It is this noble aim that is pursued by the large-scale proposals contained in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement of 15 January.

The essence of these proposals is that man should embark on the third millennium without wars and without nuclear weapons in space. To achieve this goal is the primary duty of people of goodwill, the duty of all mankind.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274



## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### USSR RAPS U.S. 'ARMS FIRST, DISARM LATER' POLICY

PMO41537 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 4, 3 Feb 86 pp 3-6

[Vladlen Kuznetsov article: "Call to the Whole World"]

[Excerpts] Lenin's Decree on Peace announced the rise of a socialist state that had declared war on war. In 1946, at the dawn of the nuclear age, the Soviet Union submitted for consideration by the United Nations a proposal to prohibit the production and use of atomic weapons. In 1982 the USSR undertook in the UN the unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and on 15 January this year, a document that ranks among these historic foreign policy initiatives of the CPSU and the Soviet government was made public—a statement by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev which set forth a programme for the total elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world within the next 15 years.

What is Washington's reaction to the Soviet plan? This is what the world public, which is yearning for real progress towards a more secure world, is concerned about at present. That reaction is perhaps slightly more favourable than it has been in recent years, the summit in Geneva is evidently prompting restraint. Nevertheless, it is not exactly an encouraging reaction.

We shall study it, they say.... It has elements that might be constructive. However, many elements have remained unchanged and give rise to serious concern....

Thus the White House. The far-reaching, bold and essentially new Soviet programme is presented as a sort of "Russian reply" to a "whole series of proposals" advanced by the United States.

The U.S. President recalled how, addressing the Japanese Parliament in 1983, he called for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. And so he did, which is all to his credit. But what followed? Nothing positive. A contrary process, the process of accumulating and modernizing nuclear weapons continued on the other side of the ocean as if nothing had happened. It is noteworthy, too, that as distinct from the attitude to the Soviet project, hardly anyone took the president's call seriously. As a matter of fact, it was designed solely to impress his Japanese audience.



While talking about the "Spirit of Geneva" and "a new start" in Soviet-American relations, the other side is in fact moving in a direction quite other than that jointly mapped out in Geneva. In briefing his delegation on the eve of the fourth round of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons, Ronald Reagan "edited" the jointly coordinated agenda on his own way by excluding from it the issue of preventing an arms race in space.

In the meantime, the President's favourite brainchild--the Strategic Defence Initiative--which has given mankind the headache of preventing "Star Wars" is steadily developing muscle, nuclear muscle included, despite all assurances of its non-nuclear origin. Laser systems are being developed for the "space shield," turning it into a sword. Referring to expert opinion, the LOS ANGELES TIMES warns that these systems may serve as offensive weapons and cause large-scale conflagrations capable of bringing on such ecological disasters as "nuclear winter."

And so, "nuclear winter".... It will be recalled that addressing the Soviet people the President wished them "a clear sky." The notorious Jeanne Kirkpatrick, who always speaks her mind, takes a different view. Says the former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations: "We cannot negotiate 'chistaye nebo' (clear sky) with the Soviets: we must build more weapons and put them in space in order to overcome the frightening 'Russian advantage' on earth."

Let the "Russian advantage," which frightens Jeanne Kirkpatrick, remain on her conscience. This bogey is obviously being used for the purpose of gaining military supremacy over the USSR by means of SDI. This intention is no secret to many sober-minded Americans. The Massachusetts Universities' Association Against Nuclear War believes that by proclaiming its adherence to SDI based on the development of various space strike weapons systems, the U.S. says 'No' to any constructive negotiations aimed at ending the arms race. The "Star Wars" program is the missing link in the American strategy of gaining nuclear superiority over the USSR. Its purpose is to enable the U.S. to deliver a first nuclear strike with impunity.

Another line of this strategy is to ensure military superiority in Europe, in the immediate vicinity to the Soviet borders, by means of first-strike nuclear weapons. At present new cruise missiles are being added to the 108 Pershing 2's already deployed on FRG soil. At the same time those in Washington unashamedly claim that the negotiations on medium-range nuclear arms are the most promising avenue of progress at the Geneva talks. This is hardly surprising, however, in the light of the absurd "Arm first, disarm later," concept they proceed from.

While it is in fact a programme for achieving military superiority, SDI is still being publicized as the best way of making nuclear weapons "useless and obsolete."

In other words, Washington suggests that in order to achieve security and nuclear disarmament weapons should be orbited first and then brought back to earth whereupon nuclear weapons will, as if by magic, become useless. This is indeed a most ingenious way of ridding the world of nuclear arms. One cannot

help but recall in this connection the high-ranking U.S. official who, at the end of the forties, tried to convince the inhabitants of the Bikini Atoll which has become a proving ground for atomic weapons that these weapons would bring mankind prosperity and peace and put an end to all war. What nuclear weapons have brought mankind over the forty years of the arms race is common knowledge. And now Washington is pushing SDI.

True, it is not claimed that the "Star Wars" programme holds out a promise of ridding mankind of wars and arms. Today's approach is different. To quote the BOSTON GLOBE: "Will there be arms control or 'Star Wars'? The SALT 2 and ABM treaties or an arms race?" This is the heart of the matter.

In his statement Mikhail Gorbachev offers a different way. Instead of wasting the next 10 to 15 years on the development of new and extremely dangerous space weapons, would it not make more sense to concentrate on the destruction of nuclear weapons and eventually get rid of them altogether? Such an approach is in keeping with any sober-minded person's idea of rationality, expediency, logic and common sense. The striking difference between the two approaches has not escaped the notice of the world public. "Ronald Reagan suggests that the threat posed by nuclear arms be removed by setting up a nuclear umbrella," the PARIS LIBERATION writes. "Mikhail Gorbachev, on the other hand, proposes a simpler and cheaper solution to the problem: total elimination of these weapons."

The Soviet Union has a detailed, thoroughly thought-out and well balanced plan of universal and complete disarmament, and a strategy for safeguarding universal peace and international security. And what does Washington have to offer? According to the NEW YORK TIMES' Tom Wicker, "The Reagan Administration lacks a strong, clear direction in its arms control policy."

It prefers to allow another course--that of the unrestrained accumulation of armaments on earth and in outer space, and of seeking military superiority. Those in Washington are not in a hurry to break the habit of thinking only in terms of "power politics." The great art of living together, side by side with the other system, and of taking each other's interests into account comes hard to them. It remains beyond their grasp that the current global political and military-strategic situation offers the world no option other than peace and disarmament. They are still trying to "contain the Russians" by means of this or that "superweapon" instead of learning to contain themselves, as the veteran diplomat George Kennan advises them to do. His advice has fallen on deaf ears.

Their intention is "to dash rather than build a relationship based on mutual interest," political scientists Richard Barnet writes in the NEW YORK TIMES. "In Washington's view our Soviet adversary is to be managed by steadily increasing the threat we pose to it. Indeed, the administration appears to deny that we have any interest in common with 'the evil empire.' The approach to negotiation has been grudging and the proposals so far safely non-negotiable." This statement hits the nail on the head. From this description of American policy towards the USSR and many other countries, the writer draws the conclusions that Washington's chauvinism and hegemonism, the "Rambo" style, "has no place in a world of nuclear weapons and more than 160 countries."

It is a pity that the administration has not yet reached such a conclusion and has not changed its view to suit the realities and requirements of the age. Transoceanic "Rambo" holds on to his nuclear big stick and is obsessed with getting hold of a space stick as well. It does not occur to him that he is not alone in the world or that strength has never served anyone as a substitute for reason. Unfortunately, there are no indications of Washington being prepared to put into practice its own much-publicized credo of rendering nuclear weapons "useless and obsolete." Rather the contrary is true.

The programme the USSR has submitted to the world community urges an end to military confrontation and rivalry and a changeover to understanding and accord in matters of war and peace. In the history of various nations and of mankind as a whole there have been periods calling for the utmost exertion of spiritual and physical powers. We are going through one such period today when it is necessary to save the world from war. The Soviet Union suggests that all international affairs, relations and talks be planned, and the efforts of all nations coordinated and pooled in such a way as to break the vicious circle of war as we approach the state of the new century.

Mankind is not doomed to live on the brink of the nuclear abyss, under the Damoclean sword of space nuclear weapons. Man has created weapons, and man can destroy them. He must do so in order to remove the threat of self-destruction in a nuclear holocaust.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### MOSCOW TV INTERVIEWS PAUL WARNKE ON GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

LD261810 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 26 Jan 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Fedor Burlatskiy, interview with Paul Warnke, former head of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and current chairman of the Public Committee for National Security, by Washington correspondent Vladimir Dunayev; Warnke in English fading into superimposed Russian translation; Warnke, Dunayev seen sitting at desk throughout; date, place not given--recorded]

[Text] [Warnke] I find the statement [by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev] very encouraging, especially as regards the concrete measures which it proposed should be taken first. I find the concrete measures proposed by the Soviet Union very, very constructive.

For example, your leader calls for a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive missiles and warheads over a 5-year period. The statement says 5 to 8 years, but I would prefer the shortest period. The statement also proposes decisive steps toward eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe. This must lead to deliverance from U.S. Pershings and land-based cruise missiles and Soviet SS-20 missiles in Europe.

I find the initiative very concrete and absolutely attainable. I also consider the proposals for wider mutual verification a very encouraging element in the statement. That proposal did encourage me.

If the matter of on-site inspection can be resolved in connection with the observance of a possible ban on nuclear tests and in connection with eliminating chemical weapon stocks, then that will move us forward very, very quickly. This is a gesture of goodwill and I was extremely happy to read this in the statement. I also hope for a constructive response from my country.

[Dunayev] But will this constructive response come? To be sure, several obstacles are being put up against the Soviet initiatives. The initial statements of an official nature from Washington resounded with an unwillingness to halt nuclear explosions and, similarly, the "Star Wars" plans are also being transformed into a sacred cow.

[Warnke] I would like to see a cessation of all nuclear tests. This is a highly desirable goal. But, nonetheless, it is not an indispensable condition



for progress in other disarmament directions. As far as I can judge, the main obstacle is the Strategic Defense Initiative; specifically, the uncertainty in relation to strategic defense. I believe that while both sides are uncertain as to what the other side is about to do as regards strategic defense there is very little hope indeed of noticeable reductions in offensive weapons.

I would like to put forward my own ideas on strategic defense. Both sides must agree that nothing should go beyond the limits of laboratory research. It also must be firmly stipulated that neither side will move from research, that is general laboratory research, to testing weapon prototypes; still less to deploying them.

If we can agree not to go outside the laboratory then there will be sufficient mutual trust to begin reducing offensive nuclear weapons because both sides will recognize there is no surprise awaiting them in the form of a swift deployment of strategic weapons which would reduce the chances of restraining a nuclear weapons buildup to zero.

There is a risk in this. If tests are carried out then deployment is near and reduction in strategic offensive missiles becomes impossible.

[Dunayev] But why does the U.S. Administration insist so much on testing parts for space weaponry, or strategic defense as you call it. For Washington today research means testing as well and practically deployment. That is dangerous and worrisome. How do you view such logic?

[Warnke] Tests of any means of strategic defense based in space, in the sea, or in the air, or that which is mobile land-based is absolutely and completely banned by the ABM Treaty. Both sides must agree without contradiction to obey that treaty's stipulations. If we do that then we will have the mutual confidence which will make it possible to achieve the most serious reductions in strategic offensive weapons.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### USSR HITS ADELMAN REMARKS ON ARMS ISSUES

#### Army Paper Comment

PM241528 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Feb 86 Second Edition p 3

[Military observer V. Chernyshev "TASS Commentary for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA": "Mr Adelman's Trials and Tribulations"]

[Text] In Philadelphia K. Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency [ACDA], has delivered a speech full of feigned pathos, hypocrisy, and distortions of the actual state of affairs in the international arena.

"Critically important, difficult, and disquieting times have come for us who work in the arms control field. As they used to say in the sixties, the eyes of the world are upon us!" Adelman exclaims. Yes, the times are important and demand responsibility, a constructive approach, and a real desire to solve the problems of ridding the world of the nuclear danger, firmly closing the door to an arms race in space, and sharply reducing the dangerous arsenals of weapons on earth. But what did the director of the U.S. agency have to tell the world? What are the difficulties disquieting him?

Speaking about the arms reduction and limitation process, Adelman states: "I have been writing and thinking about this process for the last 10 years, but the fundamental problems and questions remain unresolved." One might ask him what the problem is. The answer to this question probably lies in precisely what Adelman himself has written and stated. For he was the source of the following "confession": "Nuclear arms limitation talks are just a game we have to play to placate the U.S. people and our allies."

Now the agency head is claiming that the United States devotes great attention to the talks on nuclear and space weapons. He immediately "reveals" the essence of this "attention": The United States seeks to reduce nuclear arms, but will not agree to abandon SDI -- that is, the "star wars" program -- and should seek a path which "would make it possible to get arms control and SDI to work together." A game indeed, to use Adelman's own words. To state that the accumulation of mountains of weapons reaching up to the stars can be accompanied by arms control, means to have an extremely low opinion of his audience's mental capacities.

Of course, the ACDA head cannot fail to realize that there cannot be strategic nuclear arms reductions without a ban on the militarization of space and any assertions of a "desire" to reduce these arms are worthless if the United States refused to agree to such a ban. But Mr Adelman does not wish to realize something else: A game of this kind can no longer "placate" the U.S. people and the U.S. allies. Nor does he realize

that he looks simply ridiculous in expressing "the hope that the Russians will join" the United States in implementing the commitment regarding the Geneva talks adopted at the Soviet-U.S. summit. For it is precisely Washington, in locking the door to the solution of the problem of the nonmilitarization of space, which is displaying its refusal to fulfill this commitment and thereby showing that it does not want to end the arms race on earth either.

When addressing the extensive Soviet peace program spelled out in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement Adelman did not even risk mentioning its main idea -- ridding mankind of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000. He refers to this program as "a recent proposal" and patronizingly adds that it contains "some constructive elements." "But other elements in this proposal are generally standard for the Russians." It is as if Adelman is ignorant of the fact that the U.S. Administration, if it is really committed to the objective of eliminating nuclear weapons, as is often declared in Washington, is being offered a practical opportunity to tackle it in practice and not waste the next 10-15 years creating [na sozdaniye] extremely dangerous weapons in space.

However, Washington figures like Adelman are not enraptured by the prospect of ridding the world of nuclear arms and are repelled by the very idea of reaching agreement with the Soviet Union. So he invents all kinds of "arguments" and erects artificial barriers on the path to agreement. He accuses the Soviet Union quite groundlessly of "violating" existing agreements, advances the notorious "verification [kontrol] problem," and so forth.

Some people in Washington dream of obtaining one-sided advantages over the Soviet Union both along the path of the arms race and also in the process of negotiations. Why, for example, does the SALT II treaty not suit them? Adelman himself "explained" one of the reasons with a kind of frankness. If the United States had ratified this treaty, he said, "a dangerous precedent for future negotiations would have been created...since the criteria envisaged by the SALT II treaty would be used." In the Joint Statement of Principles and Basic Guidelines for Subsequent Negotiations on the Limitation of Strategic Arms, which is an integral part of the SALT II treaty, the sides stated that they will seek objectives on the basis of equality and identical security. This is precisely what is not to the liking of those who dream of achieving military superiority. But in Philadelphia Adelman, this specialist in obstacles and impediments to disarmament, went so far as to say that the Soviet Union "is the main threat to our ideals, our security, and our entire future."

Adelman and his ilk in the United States are "terrified" that the specific Soviet program is known to the entire world and is widely approved throughout the world. The policy of those representatives of imperialist circles who attempt to conceal their negative actions behind extravagant phrases looks very unsavory in this light. These circles realize and are fearful that they will have to answer to their peoples.

#### 'Gross Slander'

LD212124 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Commentary by political commentator Vitaliy Kobyshev -- from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] It has emerged that what are called situation games are regularly arranged at the White House. Various situations, ranging through to the most extreme ones such as universal nuclear war, are simulated in the course of these games.

One is discovering, however, that this is only one aspect of the games. It appears they have also been undertaken with regard to the broad-scale Soviet proposals set forth in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement. On the one hand, the U.S. authorities have been publicizing their, on the whole positive reaction to the proposals in every way, but on the other, as a follow-up and often without a pause after the compliments, they have been stating that the Soviet program is not to U.S. liking and that it is unrealistic.

An example of this strange type of game is the speech U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Director Kenneth Adelman gave in Philadelphia.

After dutiful words in favor of the Geneva meeting of Soviet and U.S. leaders, Adelman immediately corrected himself, saying: The better we understand each other, the more profoundly we realize the fundamental differences that exist between us. Evidently in order to reinforce this thesis, Adelman made a declaration on the aggressive character of Soviet conduct in the international arena and said that the Soviet Union is creating the main threat to our ideals, our security, and our entire future. With regard to the Soviet proposals, he said: Although they do contain some potentially constructive elements other parts of them constitute the standard Soviet menu. Who, then, does not find this menu to their liking? One must assume that it is the U.S. military-industrial complex, first and foremost. Adelman himself has apparently forgotten that of late he is in charge of the disarmament agency. What kind of disarmament can it be, if he declares outright that the United States will not set about exchanging its SDI, that is, the "star wars" program?

It will not set about exchanging its SDI. This trading language on Adelman's part means just one thing: Specifically, that Washington is presently concerned not so much with the substance of the peaceful proposals forwarded by the Soviet Union as with the search for a more or less smart way of avoiding a direct response to them. Indeed, this is not a matter of games. The U.S. authorities' adherence to the "star wars" plans, which has been proclaimed once again, and Adelman's gross slander against the Soviet Union are two lines of one and the same course -- a course aimed at U.S. military superiority and, accordingly, an opportunity to do whatever it sees fit in the world. This course is being referred to in Washington without reticence as neoglobalism. Neoglobalism, which has been shown yet again by Adelman's speech, is the old U.S. course aimed at diktat in world affairs in new packaging.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274



## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### IZVESTIYA'S FALIN DEMANDS 'SUBSTANTIVE' U.S. RESPONSE

PM211514 Moscow IZVESTIYA 'in Russian 21 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Valentin Falin "Political Observer's Opinion": "There Must Be a Substantive Response"]

[Text] It is more than a month since the publication of the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the Soviet Union's submission of a range of new foreign policy initiatives aimed at ensuring that mankind greets the year 2000 under peaceful skies and space, with firm confidence in its peaceful future.

These days a month is a considerable period. But the official West, usually so quick to react, is silent. Not counting a few courteous remarks.

Certain commentators claim that the Soviet proposals have pitched Washington into confusion and despondency. Saying "no" would mean acting the king with no clothes in public. Saying "yes" would be even worse: They would have to accept what the U.S. Administration has been avoiding like the plague for the last 5 years. There is only one way out -- to drag their feet and confuse the issue. A 17th century French thinker described this kind of action thus: "So-called know-alls like to be confused by what is clear and not to understand what is entirely obvious."

What do today's know-alls find unclear? They can in no way understand, you see, who would benefit from a world without nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons. Washington's concern is to reduce other military potentials, but not its own. If the "perfidious Russians" advocate not only detente, but a detente that deprives militarism of a voice, then they are probably not doing it to harm themselves. What attraction would there be in a world in which the United States could not just take what its heart desired wherever its gaze alighted. The dollar, of course, does count for something, but its full weight is felt only when it is backed not merely by U.S. treasury assets, but by Pentagon cash. It is the latter that makes up for the "decaying" effect of equal rights.

Thus, an official reply is still awaited. Meanwhile, the Western public is being gradually prepared for that longest of journeys known in all languages as a "detour." A trip on post-horses, with many stops, far from the nub of the problems -- that is the approximate scenario.

Proposing nothing substantive for its part, Washington "will take note" of Soviet "concessions." The possibility of talks, specifically on concluding an interim agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe, or accords on destroying chemical weapons or reducing conventional arms and armed forces must be conditional on

Soviet readiness to accept a number of preliminary conditions imposed by the United States and its allies. The U.S. side intended to escape a ban on nuclear weapons and a timetable for removing them from states' arsenals with vague and entirely non-committal arguments. Not everything is clear about tests. Rather, it is not clear whether any new arguments will be put forward to justify the rejection of a moratorium. But, first and foremost, Washington intends to avoid any linkage [vzaimosvyaz] between the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear means and nuclear arms altogether and the non-siting of strike systems in space. A piece of "diplomatic cunning" is permitted as an option -- the "star wars" topic will be omitted from the response. As if it did not already exist.

In other words, a classic deception maneuver is being hatched. It is meant to trigger a controversy and set the public guessing who is right and who is guilty, since not every specialist is capable of getting to the bottom of the problem. That is why particular hopes are being pinned on the external effect and on the trenchancy of formulas and expressions. The overall tone -- and U.S. envoys have been trying this out in West European capitals -- is that the Soviet comprehensive plan cannot be taken as a basis since it requires the breakup of NATO military doctrines and allegedly gives the Soviet Union unilateral advantages.

Prompted from overseas, the European NATO members -- some directly, others by allusion -- are looking for trickery primarily in our main proposal on the phased elimination of nuclear weapons. Their zeal in attempting to prove the impossibility and harmfulness of denuclearization [dezatimizatsiya] leads certain people into conflict with... Reagan. The President sings the praises of his "Strategic Defense Initiative" as the sole practical means of making nuclear weapons "obsolete and unnecessary." But FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner states: "I consider this to be an illusion."

"I think that the complete elimination of nuclear weapons as a result of the development [razrabotka] of SDI," the minister stresses, "is unattainable in the foreseeable future." Incidentally, U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger agrees with him.

Perhaps even stronger attacks are made on the idea of ridding Europe of nuclear weapons or at least, of certain nuclear weapons systems. To listen to certain figures it would seem that without nuclear arms the West's integrated defense would disintegrate into disparate unequal fragments. To the delight of the Soviet Union, "We in Europe," U.S. General Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander, said the other day, "should in no way be wanting a zero option in the nuclear sphere. For the destruction of medium-range weapons would mean that Pershing and cruise missiles would disappear from Europe, that is, there would not be any of the weapons which are the link between European and U.S. security, since only these medium-range weapons can reach Soviet territory." In order to rule out an interim solution beforehand, the United States is giving London and Paris promises ahead of time to promote the modernization of their nuclear arsenals and to be deaf to any proposals mooted by British and French participation in international efforts to limit the nuclear arms race.

They are also laying a trap ahead of time for an agreement on reducing conventional arms and armed forces. With reference to Europe they allege that "geographic asymmetry" could be an insuperable obstacle. After all, in the event of complications the United States would have to ship heavy weapons from overseas while the Soviet Union, as a European country, would have them at hand. Soon they will be saying that, to play safe and "facilitate planning," the NATO strategists should be given a little extra to take account of the poor roads in the Soviet heartland, which have been so unwelcoming to uninvited guests in the past. In addition to the demands that are

being made, two U.S. tanks would be equated to one Soviet tank and corresponding 'asymmetrical counting' would be applied to all types of heavy arms.

I will not burden readers with details. The reaction at the "working level" is commensurate with the aggressive military doctrines of the United States and the NATO bloc as a whole and in line with the rejection of everything that formed the basis of mutual understanding in the seventies. Today Western rulers are not interested in concepts such as mutual benefit. It seems that they see their advantage mainly in placing the socialist countries at a disadvantage; whatever might give us balanced advantages is perceived as an encroachment on imperialism's position, a time bomb, or abandonment of the plans for social revenge. If they had their way, these rulers would long since have forced all peoples to learn by heart the U.S. or other versions of "democracy." Fortunately, they have been unable to achieve this for almost 70 years now.

What next? We can expect fierce opposition from the opponents of stopping the arms race. The peoples cannot achieve a single step toward lasting peace without a struggle. And that struggle consumes a great deal of time and effort. However, Washington cannot avoid a response, a substantive response, to the Soviet proposals and the questions posed by life itself -- the sternest judge in matters of what is true and false.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## **U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS**

### **USSR: 'NOTHING CONSTRUCTIVE' IN U.S. RESPONSE TO PROPOSAL**

**LD232145 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Feb 86**

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Over 5 weeks have passed since the publication of the Soviet program for delivering mankind from nuclear and chemical weapons in this very century. The world has grown tired of waiting for a U.S. response to our peaceful initiatives. Western observers write that the delay has been caused by disagreement within the U.S. Administration and that the Pentagon is putting the brakes on things.

In order to reach agreement with the allies on the U.S. counterproposals Nitze and Rovny, two high-ranking emissaries from the White House, have been on a trip around the capitals of several states in Europe and Asia.

Certain well-informed observers believe that the White House is going to give its response on the eve of, or even on the opening day of, the 27th CPSU Congress to insure that the Soviet Union is left with no time to react to the U.S. position in the political report at the congress. If this really is the case, it indicates yet again the lack of seriousness of the Washington administration and that it is more concerned with arranging propaganda contests than with really looking for paths to disarmament and peace.

So, as yet there is no official reaction from the United States, but it is being fore-stalled by U.S. observers' reports. The content of Washington's counterproposals has already become the property of the Western press. It is possible that these information leaks have come about deliberately to prepare public opinion.

How then does this response, which has been proposed, look? Even a cursory look at the White House position shows that there is practically nothing constructive in it. However, there is an obvious attempt by the U.S. President to create the appearance of a positive approach. In order to implement this design the Americans are dismembering the Soviet peace program, although it is presented as a single whole. The United States is picking out of it the parts which suit it best, casting the others aside. So, in principle, they agree to a 50-percent reduction in nuclear weaponry. It is true that they have their own way of understanding 50 percent, but they do not wish to renounce the Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan -- that is the "star wars" program which is undermining the very idea of reducing nuclear weapons.

The United States is also, it would appear, in favor of eliminating U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe. But, at the same time they reject our proposal on freezing the corresponding British and French nuclear forces and on the United States

not supplying its missiles to other countries. To justify this they say that freezing British and French nuclear arsenals runs counter to plans which they adopted earlier to modernize them and in particular, equipping the British Navy with new U.S. Trident missile-equipped nuclear submarines. The unacceptability of this approach is evident. The Soviet Union is proposing disarmament while the partners of the United States in NATO will increase their nuclear might. Furthermore, they are demanding that we eliminate half or even most of our medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union. In other words, the White House is as before adhering to its notorious zero option in only a slightly revamped form.

Let me repeat that our analysis is based on data in the U.S. press. As yet, there is no official response. One would like to think that it will be carefully thought out and constructive. To be sure, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted in his message to the Geneva Disarmament Conference, mankind has reached a turning point in its history where it must choose which path to follow next -- either to overcome the inertia of the past when security was seen primarily through the prism of positions of strength and military and technical decisions or to remain the hostage of the arms race, involving nuclear, chemical, and in the future, other no less threatening weapons.

A clear and consistent path was indicated in our 15 January statement. In particular, it envisages the destruction of all medium-range missiles in just the first stage of eliminating nuclear weapons. We attribute special importance to the problem of liberating Europe from nuclear weapons and primarily, from medium-range missiles which are seriously undermining European security. It only takes 8 minutes for a Pershing-2 sited in the FRG to fly to Soviet territory. As a result, the possibility of conflict coming about even accidentally is increased and at the same time, the people of West Germany have to play the unenviable role of nuclear hostages.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274



## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### USSR 'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS' PROGRAM

LD212353 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1715 GMT 21 Feb 86

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program, conducted by All-Union Radio foreign-political commentator Vladimir Pasko, with Major General Viktor Mikhailovich Tatarnikov]

[Excerpt] [Pasko] Hello, comrades. I will begin with a letter from a teacher called Rogovtsova from Leningrad. I fully support the statement by Comrade Gorbachev on 15 January, Lyudmila Sergeyevna writes. It seems to me, she continues, the proposals contained in it ought to receive the support of every government which is really striving for the strengthening of its people's security. But why is the United States avoiding a response to them? There are many such letters in the radio mailbag. It is obvious to everyone that the Soviet program for the banning and destruction of nuclear weapons during a historically brief period, with a ban on space strike weapons, creates a realistic possibility for removing the nuclear threat by the end of the century, and of halting the arms race.

The position of the United States, which has so far given no response to our constructive initiative, has given rise to peoples' indignation, to say the least. For the U.S. Administration has repeatedly made loud statements about its adherence to peace. The authors of a number of letters -- in particular Zaslavskiy from Moscow, Sukhorukov from Kharkov, and Markeyevich from the Belorussian town of Lida -- ask: What approach, in general, does the U.S. leadership take to the concept of national security? An answer to this is contained in an interview sent by our correspondent in the Swedish capital Valentin Gubernatorov. It is also a reply to the comrades who are interested in the course of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe. So, at the microphone is Major General Viktor Mikhailovich Tatarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation at the conference.

[Tatarnikov] The program for the elimination of nuclear weapons in the world by the year 2000, which was put forward in the statement by Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is receiving a positive response in Stockholm at the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe. Speaking at the conference, Dumas, the French minister for external relations, stated on 28 January: Mister Gorbachev has proposed that the nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States of America be reduced. This is a step in the right direction. We want this ourselves. Speaking at the conference on the same day, Genscher, the FRG foreign minister, stated that the new proposal by General Secretary Gorbachev of 15 January 1986 could provide an important stimulus to the talks and could open up a possibility for continued progress. This acknowledges



that the Soviet long-term program for the destruction of nuclear weapons in the world requires a consistent stepping up of efforts, not only at this forum but also at other talks.

Undoubtedly a struggle lies ahead, a serious struggle. And in this respect I should like to dwell on certain aspects of a military nature, first of all from the point of view of national security. This concept is often used by the United States in order to justify, for example, the development of nuclear armaments and the arms race in space. It is asserted that the Strategic Defense Initiative program is being developed purely in the interests of national security. But let us look at what aspects there are of national security today. The point is that notions about interests of national security which existed earlier are outmoded in the nuclear age.

For example, the United States regards the concept of national security independently from international security. Well, in contemporary conditions national security is organically linked with international security, with the security of all states. Such is the truth of the nuclear age.

Further: Previously, the concept of national security rested on provision with weapons. But now, weapons are such that increases in their numbers, especially of nuclear weapons, and the appearance of new types of weapons, raise the danger that they can be put into operation -- either deliberately, or by dint of military-political miscalculation, or as a result of some technical malfunctions in the weapons systems. Reliance on computers, on automating the control and the application of weapons, is now at an extremely high state, especially in the United States. The tragedy with the U.S. Challenger ship showed how dangerous this really is.

The arms race increases the level of global danger, because it leads to the creation of dangerous weapons which are subject to ever less control. Politicians, diplomats, scientists, and military men are coming to understand this truth. The program for the destruction of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 is increasingly taking possession of peoples' minds.

Proceeding from a painstaking analysis of the situation, the Soviet concept of security in the nuclear age takes as its point of departure the fact that an improvement in the international climate, especially in the military-political sphere, presupposes first a reduction, and then the destruction of nuclear weapons. This is the path of security which we adhere to in the Soviet Union. Our proposals, set out in the statement by Comrade Gorbachev, set the task of safeguarding security in the nuclear age in a principled and new fashion. In order to understand the full import of the initiative which was expressed by Comrade Gorbachev, it is sufficient to juxtapose two approaches. One is based on the premise that nuclear, chemical, and conventional weapons will be kept, improved and stepped up, and that an arms race in space will be unleashed. The other option is that mass-destruction weapons will be eliminated and that space will remain peaceful.

In this case, another prospect opens up which promises hope -- a prospect of peaceful development and of the redirection of enormous funds from the arms race to the solution of economic problems, scientific problems, and other problems, which is needed by all of mankind. If we pursue the logic of the Reagan administration, which believes a system of defensive weapons in space to be inevitable, the question arises: What will happen if the arms race continues, if weapons begin to be deployed in space? Well, first of all this would lead to a frustration of talks -- both in Geneva and in other disarmament talks. It will lead to the undermining of existing agreements on arms

limitation. In this case, Comrade Gorbachev says, within a few years the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as their allies and the whole world, would find themselves in a situation of an absolutely uncontrolled arms race, a situation of strategic chaos, of a very dangerous undermining of stability, universal uncertainty and terror.

Can we head for such a situation, and for the sake of what should we take such a risk? The U.S. President speaks of a rescue mission. But if this is so, and he really wishes to save civilization, then why not take a shorter path, a cheaper path and -- the main thing -- a safe path: the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Surely such a path would be more logical and more acceptable. Many people in the United States now speak of the morality of the Strategic Defense Initiative, of its lofty mission. They say that, basically, missiles will be used against missiles. This fairy tale is effective with some people, but the United States is conducting the parallel development of offensive and defensive weapons.

Besides, just as the appearance of nuclear weapons did not lead to the disappearance of conventional weapons, so the appearance of offensive weapons in space will not lead to the disappearance of nuclear weapons. The development of defensive systems will lead to the development of offensive systems. This is the simple truth. Action engenders reaction. This is axiomatic. The very concept of defensive weapons is untenable. What role space strike weapons will play in orbit -- a defensive one or an offensive one -- depends on political decisions, on those figures who will push the buttons. These are weapons which react instantaneously, preventive strike weapons. They are provocative weapons which will engender a new branch of space weapons. This is what SDI will lead to, and it is precisely for this reason that this system is totally amoral.

As for strategic offensive weapons now being developed so intensively in the United States of America, such terms as destabilizing strategic offensive weapons, and stabilizing ones, are in vogue. In general this is the invention of the present administration. Among the destabilizing weapons in this sphere they include nuclear weapons in the armory of the Soviet Union, which comprise its combat might. These are, for the most part, land-based missiles. Of course, by the U.S. yardstick, these missiles would be subject to elimination as they are dangerous; they are destabilizing missiles. Instead of these they propose that other carriers should be created, for example, ballistic missiles on submarines, and strategic bombers. They want to destroy certain systems and create others. Among the stabilizing weapons they include nuclear armaments which, in fact, are in the armory of the United States. These are ballistic missiles in submarines, strategic bombers with cruise missiles, and, for example, the Pershing-2 missiles.

But of course, such opinions are quite unsubstantiated, they are simply untenable. All strategic systems are virtually identical in their strike capability. There is virtually no difference between our intercontinental missiles and, for example, the Trident submarine-based ballistic missiles, in combat effectiveness, range, accuracy. For this reason it is quite without substantiation to classify them as destabilizing or stabilizing. For this very reason, strategic offensive weapons must be considered in complex, as a single whole. On the whole, all nuclear weapons are of a destabilizing nature. It is precisely for this reason that we are proposing that all nuclear armaments be destroyed.

In the United States it is said that the problem lies in a verification system for any accords. It must be said that the U.S. Administration has high stakes on this horse. A particular demand was made that the talks be torpedoed or that the talks be frustrated. On this occasion they cast up the problem of verification as a banana peel under someone's foot in order to put the skids under any advancement toward disarmament.

On this level, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement that verification of the limitation and destruction of nuclear weapons could be implemented both by national technical methods and by means of on-site inspection smashed all these plans, all such statements. The possibilities of using verification as an obstacle to the establishment of a moratorium on nuclear explosions, for example, have now been excluded. They have no foundation.

But there are different kinds of verification. Verification of the destruction of nuclear weapons and chemical weapons is one thing: It is another to verify how many troops took part in an exercise. Were there, let us say, 20,000 or 21,000? Do we need an inspection for this on each account? And would the troops face inspections before arriving for this verification?

The delegations of the Warsaw Pact states have put forward very constructive options for verification in this respect, which take account of the use of both national technical methods and methods of inquiry and of discussion of any infringements of the system by all the participant states. So verification is not a problem at the conference. It can be totally regulated within a determined framework.

It must be noted that here has been observed the greatest bottleneck, and it is the fault of the NATO states! It is the question of notification concerning major exercises, not only by land forces but also by air and naval forces, as well as transfers of troops. That is, the whole spectrum of military activity. They only want to give notification about the military activity of land troops. But where is the development of the Helsinki Final Act here? Naturally, the Soviet Union and the socialist countries are actively seeking a solution here. The latest statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev provides the possibility for resolving this problem.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### USSR'S 'TOP PRIORITY' PROGRAM DISCUSSES GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

LD242210 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 23 Feb 86

["Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Posner, with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the United States of America and Canada Institute]

[Text][Posner] Hello and welcome to "Top Priority." In the panel today with me are Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the United States and Canada Studies Institute. I am your host, Vladimir Posner. The Soviet Communist Party opens its 27th Congress 2 days from now and we can be absolutely sure that the political report by the general secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, will concentrate on relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, on foreign relations in general, and one of the questions that must come up is that of nuclear disarmament.

With that mind I would like to put before you some of the questions that have been asked in the West concerning the statement that was made by General Secretary Gorbachev concerning the possibility to achieve total nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. Now I will play the role of devil's advocate today and I would like to take some of the more generally argued viewpoints in the West, one of them being that in general the whole idea of nuclear disarmament is idealistic: it cannot be achieved; peoples, countries, nations, have never disarmed voluntarily and basically to propose this is more a propaganda ploy than it is a realistic approach. Now who would like to take the bull by the horns? Dr Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] Well, that sounds very familiar to me. I hear that from different quarters in the West and I tend to agree with (?it), that really that ideal of nuclear disarmament is idealistic ideal, but I don't understand what's wrong with that. [sentence as heard] What's wrong with that, really, it's idealistic, but it is such a great idealism that it is worthwhile to fight for that. That's number one. Number two, it's qualitatively new situation. If we talk of disarmament as an ideal that we are trying to reach, it's OK, but now we are talking not about the disarmament as such, but we are talking about the saving the humanity, just to save the humanity from the nuclear catastrophe. It's something very different. And I believe that at every corners of the world, including our listeners in the States, there is a growing, you know, concern about the danger of the nuclear war.

So, what's the way to get rid of that? There is only one way to my mind, just to get rid of nuclear weapons, the source of the danger, so what's idealistic, what's wrong with that ideal? And I believe that it's very practical.

It's very practical because maybe for the first time in the history of the mankind, the danger which is lying over our heads, became so real, so obvious, that there is an all-



out desire just to get rid of it and there is a tremendous pressure on the governments possessing the nuclear arms, just to do something to get rid of them. So if it is idealistic let it be idealistic, I don't mind about it. Let's do the business, that's my point.

[Posner] Yes, I would like to add one thing to that. I was listening to the vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences a couple of days ago, Mr Yevgeniy Velikhov, and he made this point, that until the recent future man could die, but mankind was eternal; but because of nuclear weapons, this is changed and now we know that humankind is not immortal because of nuclear weapons, and perhaps that is changing the outlook. Do you think that's....

[Plekhanov interrupts] I think you put your finger on it. This is a qualitatively new situation in the history of mankind. For the first time, nations have weapons which can put an end to human history. At first that was not realized. If for instance you look at the public opinion polls taken in the United States in the fifties, people were remarkably light-minded, shall I say, about nuclear weapons. They thought that, well, those were just weapons which were very powerful but with which you can fight and win wars. Well now after 40 years of the nuclear arms race people have become more realistic about what nuclear weapons can do to the world and in fact if you look at the, again at the public opinion polls, for instance, a solid majority of Americans are in favor of nuclear disarmament. If that means they are idealistic, I am all for such idealism. Of course I mean almost, well, everybody; 100 percent of Soviet citizens, I'm quite certain about that, are in favor of doing away with nuclear weapons. In any country you can take a poll you will see that majority. There is a consensus in the world and there is a commitment in the world to do away with nuclear weapons, so governments, experts, have to do something.

[Posner] Yes, that's true, but nevertheless, then let's take a look at some of these statements. Frederick Kempe and John Fialka in THE WALL STREET JOURNAL -- their response to the Soviet proposal was, here is the headline: U.S. Welcomes Soviet Arms Plan but Dismisses Part as Propaganda. I quote Fialka, who says: Propaganda aimed at destroying support for the President's Strategic Defense Initiative. OK, that's one. THE ASSOCIATED PRESS reporter Barry Schweid approached readers to look at the plan sceptically. OK? In THE NEW YORK TIMES editorial Flora Lewis declared that, and I quote now, "Mikhail Gorbachev has gone too far in his efforts to arouse Western public opinion. There are a lot of things wrong with Washington's arms control stand, but they are not going to be overcome by a spectacular proposal to rid the world of nuclear weapons in 15 years." Serge Schmemmann, THE NEW YORK TIMES bureau chief in Moscow, also in THE NEW YORK TIMES, had a story under the headline "Peace Plan or Ploy," and he reported that diplomats, I quote, found the overall proposal utopian and propagandistic. Now, what I want to ask you is on the one hand you say people want disarmament, people are for disarmament, what is all this view now in what is not considered to be the reactionary press, you're talking of THE NEW YORK TIMES, you're talking about THE WALL STREET JOURNAL. [sentence as heard]

[Plekhanov] THE WALL STREET JOURNAL is right-wing.

[Posner] [Laughter] Alright, it's right-wing, but why this, why this (?view) of kind of you know, dampening the atmosphere and saying it won't work?

[Bogdanov] Look, Vladimir, after all it is quite natural, nobody expected that this aspect, Gorbachev's proposal, would be accepted just like that with the hands, you know, clapping hands.



That is OK, we accept it. Nobody expected that! By the way, that's very realistic, (four) very realistic approach to that. What is going on over there now? Just a discussion, you know, and I believe it is quite natural that different people have different views on our proposal. Our proposal is not a kind of ultimatum, you accept it or you take it or not, you know. It's just a proposal, it's just some very important ideas for discussion, which are on the table. So if Flora Lewis thinks it's too far, OK, that is her opinion; if Schmemmann thinks something different, that is his opinion. But what's important, you know, that people are thinking about that, we pushed them, all of them, to think about the importance of solving that problem. Number two, they say it's a propaganda ploy. Again, it is my very personal view, what's wrong with that kind of propaganda, if it is propaganda? It is a propaganda for peace. If you call it propaganda and propaganda has some bad smell, you know, but since it is for peace I am for that propaganda. It is not a propaganda for war, for another, you know, spiral, in the arms race. So that's my view on that, you know.

[Posner] Yes, (?please).

[Plekhanov] I think in the objections advanced with regard to the statement by Comrade Gorbachev, I think there are two kinds of people, honest sceptics and diehard opponents of nuclear disarmament. I can understand the sceptics because they have seen a lot of good proposals shot down and therefore some of the people who have seen the history of efforts, futile efforts, for nuclear disarmament may have become sceptical, very sceptical, about the possibility of achieving anything like that. And I think it's necessary to try, it's necessary to discuss and I think that this proposal is radically different from all the previous ones in the way it has been worked out. It is a practical proposal, and it takes into account the experience accumulated over the years in arms control area. It takes into account the positions of both sides and is designed to be a blueprint for practical measures for disarmament. As far as the other half of the people raising objections is concerned, the diehard opponents, I can understand them, too, but I think their viewpoint is something that will not really get a lot of support in any country, including the United States.

[Posner] You say you can understand them. Would you please explain what you mean by that?

[Plekhanov] Well, I mean I understand why they advance those proposals. Those are people who have a vested interest in the nuclear arms race. Either they are materially interested, for instance the firms which....

[Posner interrupts] You're talking about the military-industrial complex, I take it?

[Plekhanov] The military, yes, military-industrial complex.

[Bogdanov] And I would definitely add to that academic complex which supplies ideas to military-industrial complex how to use nuclear arms.

[Plekhanov] Yes. For instance, if you are committed to an idea of building a new and better, more accurate nuclear weapon, and that's your dream and this is what you plan to spend the next 10 years of your life (on) and then suddenly you read about this proposal. You say, well, come on, forget about this, that's unrealistic.

[Posner] Not only your dream, but it's also your bread and your butter.

[Plekhanov] Well, dreams and bread and butter and....

[Posner] Caviar.

[Plekhanov] Caviar, right.

[Posner] There's another point I'd like to call your attention to. Again, back to THE NEW YORK TIMES 19 January editorial which seems to say that nuclear weapons are good. I'd like to quote this. What the editorial says is that nuclear weapons have forced moderation on nations and they have produced a crude hierarchy of international power. The best we can hope for, according to THE NEW YORK TIMES, is to make living with nuclear weapons less dangerous and that's something that can be achieved only if the pretense of abolition is dropped. Now what would you say to that?

[Bogdanov] You know, you know, Vladimir, it's another example of very perverse thinking that has poisoned minds for so many years living with nuclear arms, it makes you just to be really afraid to wake up one morning, to look at the world and find out there is no more of those things. But people forget that we were so far lucky, we were protected by God who didn't allow us to fight each other in the field of the nuclear, nuclear field.

[Posner] Professor Bogdanov, I have to interrupt you. Excuse me. Our audience is now falling off its chairs wondering if Prof Bogdanov is a religious man. Would you please tell us what you mean by God watching over the planet?

[Bogdanov] I know. I mean by God something very human, you know, something very, very, you know, it's a kind of, you know, it helps me to express myself. Of course, I am not religious, I am atheist but it doesn't mean that I am against, you know, [word indistinct] you know, that's my point. So....

[Posner] [Passage indistinct]

[Bogdanov] Oh yes, whatever, whatever it is, you know. So that's my point. But you know people forget that with the development of the nuclear factor, with the appearance of new and new weapons systems, with their growing accuracy, they are reaching a level when we are becoming hostages of the computers, of the buttons, you know, of unhuman factors which we cannot control, and what frightens me is that one day we will be, you know, just we will die all of us because of some technical mistake or things like that. At the same time you know, at the same time, I would very much object if we just believed that the nuclear weapon by itself saved us from, you know, from the death. I do not, you know, contest the fact that they are making a moderative effect on all of us. At the same time, nuclear weapons are not guiding our policy. [Words indistinct] to my mind very important point. So, reasonable policy, policy of common security, that's what can help us and what — that's what can save us, you know, from that. So at one hand I can understand people saying that how we could live without nuclear arms, but on the other hand I am just trying to convince those people that we have reached such a level that it is high time to get rid of them.

[Posner] Yes, well that's yes, please, Dr Plekhanov.

[Plekhanov] Yes, I think in the first place that if we look at the history of the nuclear arms race it has not been such a peaceful history.

Under the shadow of nuclear weapons hundreds of non-nuclear wars have been fought and tens of millions of people have died, so nuclear weapons haven't stopped people from fighting. Secondly, throughout the nuclear age there have been numerous cases when threats were made in that sense, nuclear threats were made. In that sense, nuclear weapons have been used in order to compel other countries from doing....

[Posner Interrupts] Yes, well, as a threat, yes, as a stick.

[Plekhanov] As a threat, as a stick. And thirdly, there have been hundreds of cases when nuclear war has almost started because of some mistakes in computers, some false alarms, some other misunderstandings, so we have been very close to the brink in the last 40 years and there is no reasonable -- there is no reason whatsoever to think that we can continue to rely on this circumstance and to continue living on this brink.

[Bogdanov] And you know, just one comment, you know. I (?understand), as I said already that I understand people worrying about how we will live without but our plan takes that into consideration because we suggest three phases and all in all 15 years, mind you, Vladimir, 15 years to get rid of that and I believe within 15 years of a steady process of nuclear disarmament at the final end we will get used to the fact that we are living without nuclear arms. [sentence as heard]

[Plekhanov] Provided there is serious commitment on both sides to move in this direction.

[Posner] This proposal has forced certain officials in the U.S. Government who prefer to remain unnamed to make some very interesting statements, one of which was quoted in the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE on 18 and 19 January. This official was quoted as saying that the Soviet proposals bring the United States and its European allies face to face for the first time with a choice they have sought to avoid: Do they want a world without nuclear weapons? Then the paper itself goes on to say that for more than a decade the military doctrine of the Atlantic alliance has rested on the notion of deterrence through the use of nuclear weapons first against a Russian attack with conventional weapons. In other words, the argument being that in conventional weapons the Warsaw Pact has such a predominance that the Western strategy has always been the one of nuclear deterrence and therefore if we do away with nuclear weapons what is going to happen.

We touched on that in one of our previous "Top Priorities," but I would like to look now at this specific aspect, that the Soviet proposal is forcing the West to come out and admit whether or not it wants a world without nuclear weapons. Do you think that that is indeed the case?

[Bogdanov] I believe it's indeed the case. It's a crucial moment. Now you have all the cards on the table. Now everything is clear, you know. Now, if you like, is the moment of truth, a great moment of truth. Or you move in the direction that at the end of which you get rid of nuclear arms, or you will say: sorry, we are not able to do that, we are so much, you know, afraid, we are so much not sure in ourselves that we cannot live without. Then of course, all of us, we will have a right to put a question: How you can live in the modern world with such a danger every minute, every second, lying over (?your head). That's number one. Number two: as to the conventional factor, you know. I advise very much our listeners over there to look once again at our proposal, just to see how it is comprehensive, that at one end you have nuclear disarmament but on the stages you have all the different kinds of disarmament, including conventional disarmament.

[Posner] Alright. There are many arguments; we've looked at quite a few. I'd like to bring up a final, if you wish, argument against nuclear disarmament, and that is the following: that if the nuclear powers disarm there is always the danger that some fanatics, some terrorist group, will develop their nuclear weapon and hold the world hostage because there will be no way to strike back in a nuclear fashion. Now, does that argument sound very impressive to you, would you support it, and if not what would you say to it?

[Plekhanov] I think it's a highly hypothetical and unrealistic scenario, which is being used because no other arguments are working. Individual fanatics and groups, to imagine it can put together a nuclear weapon and use it, for instance against the Soviet Union or the United States, I think it boggles the imagination, really.

[Posner] Mind you we're not talking about a missile, we're not talking about a ballistic missile, we're not talking about a medium range missile. We're talking about what is now being called knapsack weapons, a weapon you can carry in a (?valise).

[Plekhanov] OK. let's imagine that somebody did that. Would the response be, you know, all systems go? For instance, a hundred Minutemen, striking what? Striking that individual, or striking Antarctica? In fact I think a world without nuclear weapons would be much safer in this specific case, because if there is a nuclear explosion, hypothetically, touched off by some madman carrying a nuclear bomb in a knapsack there would be less likelihood of that evolving into a major nuclear war because there will be no major nuclear weapons to respond to such a situation. And I think the danger would be much easier to contain, and the fanatic would be much easier to do away with, so to day. So I think this argument really holds no water. We are in much greater danger in the current situation when there are 50,000 nuclear weapons in the world. Exploding just 1 percent of that amount would be enough to produce the effect of nuclear winter, which would shroud the earth and prevent the sun's rays from reaching the planet, and everything will die.

[Posner] You know, there is a rather interesting Russian saying, that it's better to be healthy and rich than sick and poor. Would you agree? [laughs] It's the truth, nevertheless! Would you agree that a world without nuclear weapons is safer and better than a world with them?

[Bogdanow] I have no doubts about that.

[Plekahnov] I have no doubts about that either. The problem is to reach that happy state.

[Posner] Well, we'll do what we can. I'm sure that the party congress will concentrate much of its efforts towards reaching that goal. Thank you very much, and until next time this is "Top Priority" wishing you good listening.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274



## **U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS**

### **PRAVDA REVIEW OF WEEK'S INTERNATIONAL EVENTS**

**PH241551 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 86 First Edition p 4**

**[Vitaliy Korionov "International Review"]**

**[Excerpts] Standardbearer of Peace**

The peoples' eyes are fixed on Moscow. Millions of supporters of peace and progress are confident that at this forthcoming congress the CPSU will lay the surest highway to mankind's liberation from the threat of nuclear war and the implementation of the peoples' desires for freedom.

Events in the international arena continue to develop in the context of the beneficial influence of M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement -- "the boldest, most all-embracing proposal ever made by either side since the times of the cold war," as the U.S. newspaper BOSTON GLOBE described it.

Caught unawares by the new Soviet initiative, the Washington administration gave an order banning its representatives from giving assessments of the Soviet initiatives, thereby giving the mass media the signal to let a kind of "iron curtain" down on the USSR's proposals. But in vain!

Through the efforts of the Soviet Union, the other socialist community countries, and all peace-loving states and peoples, a moral and political climate has now been created in the world which does not allow those who oppose the lessening of international tension the opportunity openly to reject the Soviet initiatives. "To reject the Soviet plan," the American MERCURY NEWS wrote, "would be political dynamite."

That is the reason for the maneuvering which Washington is now resorting to. Having at first declared the Soviet proposals to be a "useful step," the administration set about a "thorough study" of them. But the "study" was dragged out excessively and ended in silence, about which U.S. Senator W. Proxmire observed: "...In this case, silence was a shocking indication of weakness."

However, the silence was accompanied by feverish backstage activity. The forces of the military-industrial complex and their organ, the Pentagon, continue to offer the fiercest resistance to any progress along the path of ending the arms race.

At the same time attempts were made to persuade the governments of the NATO countries and Japan to unconditionally support the U.S. Administration's course. And they stopped at nothing. As Britain's THE GUARDIAN writes, for instance, White House envoy



Nitze "told the NATO allies that the U.S. Administration is against any concessions to the Soviet Union which would affect the independent nuclear potentials of France and Britain. The President will not yield to the pressure exerted by the Soviet Union with a view to freezing the two countries' nuclear arsenals or preventing their modernization."

"Consultations" of this kind are in reality more like efforts to push the allies onto a path of refusing to participate in the program proposed by the Soviet Union for ridding the planet of nuclear weapons. Articles in many U.S. press organs can hardly be described as other than provocative. THE WASHINGTON POST's Bonn correspondent, for instance, asserts: Signs of the approaching implementation of the accord reached at the Geneva summit about missiles in Europe have caused "consternation" in West European capitals.

Using the same old "Soviet threat" myth, they instill into the West Europeans the idea that an agreement with the Soviet Union could supposedly "undermine U.S. nuclear guarantees to Europe and increase the threat of Soviet superiority in the sphere of conventional, nonnuclear arms." Yet the Soviet Union's position on this question is quite clear: Along with the removal of mass destruction weapons from states' arsenals, the USSR proposes that conventional arms and armed forces also be subject to agreed reductions.

Also worthy of attention are the reports which keep appearing in the Western international organs to the effect that in preparing its response to the package of Soviet peace initiatives, Washington is trying to split up the package and confine itself to half-and-half decisions which, while slowing down the arms race in one avenue, would provide an opportunity to continue it with renewed vigor in others.

One can clearly see behind this the intention to prevent the resolution of questions which are of paramount significance for ensuring international security. The problem of preventing the militarization of space is undoubtedly in the forefront among these questions. The implementation of the "star wars" program can be sought only by people who do not want nuclear arms reductions on earth. At the same time, that is the position which the present U.S. leadership continues to hold. Not only is it pressing ahead with the implementation of the program to create U.S. space strike arms, it also seeks to put the industrial potential of Britain, the FRG, Japan, Italy, and even Israel at the service of its own arrogant venture. It is difficult not to agree with former U.S. Secretary of the Air Force T. Hoopes, now head of the Committee for National Security, when he says: "The Soviet proposals make clear the fact that the Reagan administration's blind adherence to the 'star wars' program is not only the main, constant barrier on the path to improved U.S.-USSR relations, but also a 'slow fuse' which must be extinguished, or else it will lead to a nightmare scenario in space."

Yet the Soviet initiatives have opened a totally new prospect for mankind. Senator C. Pell, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, notes: "We have the chance to take the first steps toward ridding the world of nuclear weapons. History will not forgive us if we waste this chance."

Naturally, the course of the CPSU and the Soviet state, which consistently seek to limit and narrow the sphere of military preparations, especially those connected with weapons of mass destruction, is meeting with increasingly wide support in the world.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## **U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS**

### **TASS: U.S. REPLY TO PEACE INITIATIVE 'LIMITED'**

**LD241506 Moscow TASS in English 1443 GMT 24 Feb 86**

[Text] Washington, February 24 TASS -- Information that the White House has prepared a reply to the large-scale Soviet peace initiative has filtered into U.S. mass media. The Soviet initiative which has been set out in the January 15 statement of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, envisages the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

Official contents of the U.S. reply have not been disclosed so far. However, judging by first press reports, the reply does not go farther than repeating the U.S. well-known non-constructive stand in this matter which is of major importance to the destiny of the world. The reply, which constitutes a propaganda stratagem designed to justify Washington's unwillingness to take real steps along the lines of ridding the world of the threat of nuclear annihilation, also pursues the aim of diverting attention from the Soviet proposals and of justifying the U.S. Administration's course towards further spiralling up the arms race.

With reference to high-ranking officials of the White House, THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper writes, for example, that the administration is hoping to recapture the initiative in the field of public diplomacy.

Attention is paid here, first of all, to the fact that it took the Washington administration almost one month and a half to react to that major peace initiative of the USSR. Nonetheless, despite the fact that the U.S. side has spent much time to prepare its reply, the reply itself is rather limited and by its scope does not compare in any way with the comprehensive, all-embracing nuclear disarmament program put forward by the Soviet Union. The reply treats only one type of nuclear-missile weaponry -- medium-range missiles. The NBC TV network points out that the U.S. reply does not even mention the problem of strategic arms.

The USA still adheres to its old stance -- tough and non-constructive -- even with regard to this problem which is by no means the main problem of nuclear disarmament. THE NEW YORK TIMES points out that Washington, while agreeing in principle with the proposal, set out in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, on the elimination of U.S. and Soviet missiles of this class in the European zone, at the same time lays down a number of conditions before the Soviet side, the conditions which are obviously aimed at preventing a mutually acceptable accord. Thus, according to the newspaper, the U.S. reply rejects two important Soviet proposals, namely, that the USA in the event of an accord should not give medium-range missiles to other countries and that Britain and France should not increase the arsenals of their nuclear-missile weaponry.

At the same time the U.S. reply is again demanding that the USSR dismantle medium-range missiles located in the Asian part of the Soviet Union.

It is not fortuitous that the U.S. ABC TV network has referred to the U.S. reply as a variety of the notorious "zero option" by means of which the United States had tried in the past to achieve one-sided superiority over the Soviet Union and in the end had deadlocked the Geneva talks on this matter. One of the leading U.S. arms control experts, Paul Warnke, former leader of the U.S. delegation in Geneva, has likewise noted an obviously non-balanced character of the U.S. reply, describing it as a not serious proposal on the part of the USA.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### SOVIET PEACE COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN EXPLAINS IMPORTANCE OF ARMS OFFER

LD181820 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 17 Jan 86

[Text] An extraordinary session of the Soviet Peace Committee has taken place in Moscow. After it was over, our correspondent interviewed Yuriy Zhukov, the committee chairman:

[Zhukov] We discussed the exceedingly important new foreign-policy initiatives put forward by our party's central Committee Politburo and by the Soviet Government and set out in the statement of Comrade Gorbachev, which were made public on 15 January. I must say that these initiatives have met with the unanimous approval of Soviet peace supporters. Everyone said that this innovative new approach to tackling the most important problems on which the life of the whole of humanity depends--and that is the point at issue currently, because there is just one dilemma, either the survival of humanity or a universal nuclear catastrophe--well, these new proposals, dictated by an understanding of the difficult and crucial nature of the present situation, were actively supported by all the participants in our session. [sentence as heard] We adopted the decision to begin a broad mass campaign to support the new Soviet initiatives. What is involved in practice? As far as our activities within the country are concerned, there will above all be an active campaign for people to make their contribution to the strengthening of peace through their work. What is involved is the personal responsibility of one and all for the cause of peace. What is needed is for the plans for the first year of the 12th 5-Year Plan, the first year of that very broad program of struggle for strengthening our economic might, and thus for strengthening our country's international position and for strengthening peace worldwide, to be fulfilled without fail and indeed overfulfilled. I think we are equal to that task.

We had an extensive and serious discussion about strengthening our links with foreign antiwar movements. We have 120 peace committees in our country. We have an enormous number of public organizations in our country which are also involved in the campaign for peace--the trade unions, the women's organizations, youth organizations, and such organizations as "Sportsmen for Peace," "Journalists for Peace," and many others. If all of us now establish contacts with our foreign partners and help to make all people in the West know about and understand the vast new programs being advanced by our party and state, then we shall be making a major contribution to the cause of peace.

A whole series of important conferences are going to take place. An international conference of nongovernmental organizations devoted to the start of Peace Year is opening in Geneva in a few days' time. Our delegation at the conference will be campaigning to ensure that all the nongovernmental organizations of the world actively join in this struggle. A session of the World Peace Council has been set for April. Then in Tbilisi in May, an international conference of nongovernmental organizations of Europe and North America will take place, convened by the United Nations within the framework of the world disarmament campaign. All these issues will also be on the agenda there, and we shall be campaigning for the implementation of our peace program.

All these international events will unquestionably be influenced by the very broad program of struggle for peace advanced by our party. We shall explain our proposals to all of them; we shall eliminate the influence of the misinformation which is being put about by many Western news media. The fact is that there are still forces in the West which have not yet learned to think in the new way, which are still not showing a sufficiently responsible approach to the tackling of the tasks on which the survival of humanity depends. I think that through their joint efforts, the participants of the antiwar movements of the whole world will perform this task and achieve a correct understanding, both of the situation which has come about in the world and of those measures by means of which it is possible to pull back from the brink of the nuclear abyss to which humanity has come dangerously close, and to begin normal, peaceful cooperation among states on the basis of peaceful coexistence without the fear of nuclear catastrophe and without the peril of nuclear war.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274



## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### USSR LT GEN VOLKOGONOV DISCUSSES GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

OWO30831 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2305 GMT 25 Jan 86

[From the "I Serve the Soviet Union" program: "On the World Map" talk by Lt Gen Professor D. A. Volkogonov, doctor of philosophy]

[Text] It has become customary to see new hotbeds of tension appearing on the world map. Large-scale NATO military maneuvers codenamed "Reforger-86" are now taking place on Bavarian territory in the Federal Republic of Germany. Over 70,000 officers and men of the Bundeswehr, U.S., and Canadian Armed Forces are taking part in the exercises. According to the newspaper FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, a U.S. National Guard brigade from Wisconsin is taking part for the first time in this kind of maneuver. [Video shows map of Europe followed by brief clip on "Reforger-86" maneuvers]

[Volkogonov] We have just watched another NATO rehearsal for war. The training is actually a rehearsal for war. All of the wars this century have been caused by the imperialists. Two world wars this century have taken 60 million human lives. But all of that fades, all of that is nothing compared with the war which is threatening humanity, and its source, as the party program draft says, is imperialism, the military-industrial complex. The address of the source of war is known--it is across the ocean.

Our party thinks there is no fatal inevitability of a world war, and our party and state are making more and more efforts to develop, prove, and practically realize this idea. A new and exceptionally important confirmation of this course is a statement by our party's General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev of 16 January. This statement in essence stands as the first complete, extensive, and detailed program for eliminating nuclear weapons and strengthening security on our planet.

In order to briefly characterize the essence of this program one could say that the first goal is to reduce the direct threat of nuclear war, the next task is to reduce further the likelihood of a nuclear war, and finally there is the ultimate task of eliminating nuclear war and wars in general from society.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his statement expresses the intention of the Soviet State and our party to do their utmost to eliminate nuclear weapons

from the world. It has been proposed that by the year 2000, the end of the millenium, nuclear weapons be eliminated in three stages. In principle the task is feasible and realistic given goodwill among nuclear powers. The statement also proposes as one of the most important steps for eliminating nuclear weapons the prohibition of testing nuclear systems and nuclear devices. Moreover, as an expression of goodwill we extend for another 3 months our moratorium on nuclear weapon testing which we started last 6 August. In essence it is not possible to perfect nuclear weapons without experiments and tests.

The statement proposes other measures and steps. In particular the need to intensify the entire talks mechanism and raise the utilization factor--if that can be said--of the agreements on these issues is outlined. Our delegation in Geneva has been given instructions in the light of this statement in order to struggle for eliminating intermediate-range weapons located in Europe, for eliminating the strategic nuclear forces of the Soviet Union and the United States, and for preventing the militarization of space, of course.

The statement particularly stresses and emphasizes that this is the most important condition because everything else will be cancelled if the Americans continue preparations to place weapons in space. The statement says that it is necessary to end production of barbaric weapons like chemical weapons and to find ways to reduce conventional armaments and armed forces. The talks being held in Vienna for reducing armed forces in Europe must achieve a positive solution. The need to reduce conventional arms is linked to the fact that because of scientific-technical progress conventional arms have reached a very high level of perfection, and some of these weapons differ very little from nuclear weapons in their effectiveness. The need to spread this process not only to Europe but to the Asian Continent as well is outlined, all the more so as there also is a nuclear power in Asia--China. In particular, the proposals contained in the statement say that at the second stage of elimination of nuclear weapons, after the Soviet Union and the United States, other nuclear powers must join this process so that by the end of the millenium there will be no nuclear weapons remaining in the world.

Finally, the statement says that these proposals, the large range of issues mentioned in them, are not addressed to the United States and NATO alone but also to the entire world, especially the developing world. The point is that by involving developing countries, the arms race deprives them of effective courses of development. The arms race swallows huge material resources. Suffice it to say that the United States has increased its budget to \$300 billion for 1986 and today it looks like a very high peak amid the flat and level plain of social programs.

It has to be said that these proposals have elicited very broad worldwide reaction and are warmly supported by ordinary people, as well as army and naval personnel. At the same time we cannot fail to be alarmed by the fact that many official leaders in Washington either try to minimize the importance of these proposals, mentioning their allegedly propagandist character or their not being new. And some, like U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, have actually said they will not give up their space ambitions, their plans for

deploying weapons in space. We know that will undermine the realization of this great and important program. Under those circumstances, for people army and navy personnel, the reply to these initiative is perfectly clear: they will fulfill their duty in a conscientious and selfless manner today, tomorrow, and always. What is essentially important for us is the formula: the better our combat readiness the less will be the likelihood of a potential aggressor daring a nuclear adventure.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### USSR WEEKLY VIEWS U.S. REACTION TO GORBACHEV PLAN

PM111525 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 5, 10 Feb 86 pp 3-4

[A. Arkhipov dispatch: "Time To Make the Choice"]

[Text] New York--The spate of optimistic Soviet initiatives has proved so powerful as to elicit this apparently spontaneous reaction from President Reagan. He welcomed them and said they would be studied very carefully. It was evidently this that enabled the NEW YORK TIMES news analyst James Reston to observe that this was perhaps the first time the American President had taken Soviet arms control proposals seriously, and this was the best news Washington had had for a long time. The initial reaction of the White House was indeed encouraging news for Americans since it is obvious that there are definite measures that Washington could take in response.

It put this to Professor Jonathan Sanders of the Averell Harriman Institute for Advanced Study of the Soviet Union.

It is very important to have an idea of the future, said Sanders. The Soviet leader's initiative provides such an opportunity. Although these ideas will be difficult to put into practice, prospects for complete elimination of nuclear weapons are good. And he singled out the proposals on medium-range weapons because they pave the way for a Soviet-American agreement.

Asked whether he believed in the sincerity of the Soviet leaders, the professor replied that it was an easy question to answer. He is, he said, a close watcher of Soviet policy. For someone who knows Soviet leaders as he does it is evident that they are sincere in their wish to avoid war. This is the underlying philosophy of the Gorbachev statement.

I spoke over the telephone to James Muller, one of the founders of the International Congress of Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

Speaking in his unhurried manner, the Boston physician said that an important aspect of the Soviet proposals was the extension of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear weapon tests. He went on to say that the organization does not believe it is "Soviet propaganda" and considers a moratorium necessary if the deadlock in the negotiations is to be broken. What is more, this is something the Soviet Union has already done.

Asked whether he felt optimistic about the future, Muller said that he was more optimistic today than several years ago. Solving the problem of the nuclear arms race is like ridding humanity of slavery. Gorbachev's proposals rise to the challenge of the nuclear age. He hoped that the U.S. idea of "Star Wars" would not prevent the realization of these proposals. It is very important to understand that "Star Wars" is not defence against nuclear weapons. The only way to make Americans secure against these weapons is to conclude sensible treaties and improve the American-Soviet relations.

Soviet initiatives sound convincing to those who take into account the interests of all sides. This is admitted even by such champions of American policy as former CIA Director William Colby. Listening to his speech, one could not help but be aware of the irrefutable logic of the new proposals: for it is practically impossible to realize the Strategic Defence Initiative before this century is out, as the U.S. Administration admits. If the proposed nuclear disarmament has been accomplished by the SDI will be meaningless.

After the President's initial spontaneous reaction the tone of comments from Washington changed. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger described as "very worrisome" the fact that in proposing nuclear disarmament, the Soviet Union had in mind the abandoning of the creation of new types of space strike weapons. Larry Speakes, White House deputy press secretary, said: "We are suspicious of Soviet moratoriums on testing." The NEW YORK TIMES reflected in recent days in its headline: "Peace Plan or Ploy?"

Some people are trying to see hidden intent where no one is trying to conceal anything. A time-tested method is to make it seem as if the proposals would only benefit the Soviet Union. The usually inquiring "independent" American press prefers not to mention that the billions of dollars spent on arms hit Americans just as hard. According to Peter Navarro, a Harvard University scholar, 25 percent of taxes, almost 10 cents of every dollar earned by Americans, go on military spending.

Some people complain that the Soviet initiatives came as a surprise and that the proposals have been made publicly and not in the quiet of a negotiation room. Such statements reflect the wish of certain political circles to prevent Soviet initiatives from being widely known and stop the growth of the American peace movement in support of a nuclear test moratorium. James Muller told me that during lectures after the moratorium was introduced in August 1985 he asked his audiences about the initiative and found that no more than 5 percent of those present were aware of the Soviet step. According to Muller, the reason is simple-Soviet actions did not get enough coverage in the American media.

It looks as if some American leaders are tending to regard the results of the Geneva summit as the final achievement of Soviet-American relations and try to play down the fact that the spirit of Geneva calls for concrete action to reduce world tension.

Characteristically, after a succession of "doubts" reminding us of Washington's favourite tactic of confusing matters with a thousand "what if's?" a lull has



settled in the press and statements by political leaders. Convinced that "counterarguments" do not stand up to criticism, American politicians have apparently got around to fulfilling the President's promise to study the Soviet proposals seriously, some in order to find common ground and others to set new obstacles in the way of future agreements.

It is not easy, of course, to adopt sensible norms of international relations in a political system whose military doctrine has for decades been geared to nuclear superiority and to serving the interests of the military-industrial complex. One key administration official admitted that the new Gorbachev proposal "forces us to make hard choices that we haven't been willing to make so far." The time to make a choice has come. The new Soviet proposals are an acid test that will show who it is that only pays lip service to nuclear disarmament and who really wants it, who sincerely wishes humanity to enter the next century rid of the crushing burden of nuclear armaments.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### TASS: U.S. DICTATES FRG STANCE ON ARMS PROPOSAL

LD211644 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 21 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Aleksey Grigoryev writes:

"Consultations", "explanations" and other propagandistic lectures, by means of which Washington is busy manipulating its NATO allies in an attempt to bring them to a common denominator, obviously make themselves felt on the banks of the Rhine. At first, Bonn assured that it was "welcoming the stand" set out by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement of January 15, and promised together with the FRG's allies thoroughly to study the proposals and particularly the new elements contained in them whereas later on West German ruling circles began more and more obviously to adjust their positions to bring them into line with the U.S. ones.

To begin with, the Christian Liberal coalition abruptly about-faced in the question of a ban on nuclear tests and on nuclear weapons as such. Back at the beginning of January, when speaking in the Bundestag, Chancellor Helmut Kohl urged the USSR and the USA to introduce such a ban. Scarcely had two weeks passed after the Soviet Union put forward proposals aimed at ridding mankind of the nuclear threat when Lothar Ruehl, state secretary of the FRG's ministry of defence set out an official line of NATO circles and of the government at a meeting of the parliamentary commission on defence: a certain number of nuclear tests will be necessary as long as the NATO strategy envisages the use of these weapons of mass destruction.

The line became known during a debate in the Bundestag, which enabled SDPG deputies to draw a clear conclusion: Bonn, upon having given consent to participation in the U.S. "star wars" programme, which automatically means a continuation of nuclear weapon testing, has practically renounced a ban on such explosions.

The farther, the more. They on the Rhine are now trying to question the entire package of Soviet peace proposals by obstructing the way to their realisation with every kind of conditions.

When speaking at a press conference in Bonn after a regular West German-Italian consultative meeting, Chancellor Helmut Kohl of the FRG, upon having made a usual diplomatic gesture by saying that "the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva gave an impetus to progressive development which can be welcomed", stated that "zero option" on the question of medium-range nuclear missiles should not be limited to Europe but should also include without fail the "Soviet missiles deployed on the other side

of the Urals". "A different settlement of the problem is not subject to discussion," Kohl maintained.

The U.S. origin of such a thesis is obvious. Reagan's "zero option" is known to have provided that the USSR was to eliminate its medium-range missiles not only in the European zone but in the country's east as well and, on the other hand, it does not rule out that the USA could transfer such missiles to its allies. Neither does it rule out that Britain and France could build up their respective nuclear arms. Of course, this is quite different from what the USSR is suggesting.

Thus, an obvious refusal to immediately ban nuclear explosions is manifest. Britain's and France's unequivocal hint at not agreeing to a freeze on their nuclear forces upon the elimination of Soviet-U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone is manifest, too, just as a demand for a simultaneous reduction in relevant Soviet weapons in Asia, the weapons which are a counterbalance to the U.S. nuclear potential existing there. Only in this way one can define Bonn's present-day stand with regard to the most pressing problems of our times. This is the stand which, really, was not worthwhile setting out in German because it had been repeatedly set out in English from Washington.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### PRAVDA: CSSR'S HUSAK SUPPORTS SOVIET ARMS PROPOSAL

PM211018 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Feb 86 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Call of the Time"]

[Text] Prague, 17 Feb -- The prevention of a nuclear catastrophe and the peaceful resolution of all international problems are the insistent call of the time, G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, stated in a speech at the Prague City CPCZ organization report and election conference.

In a number of areas of the globe, the Czechoslovak leader continued, the sparks of military conflicts are smoldering and mountains of mass destruction weapons, which threaten to destroy human civilization, have been accumulated in the world. The Soviet Union, showing a sense of responsibility for the planet's future, has put forward a wide-ranging program aimed at reducing and entirely eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons by the year 2000. However, certain circles in the United States are trying, on various pretexts, to cast doubt on these realistic proposals and avoid specifically replying to them. They are continuing to strive for domination over the world, and the military-industrial complex in the United States does not want to abandon the immense profits which the arms race brings it.

The Czechoslovak people are well aware how deeply the questions of war and peace concern their vital interests. That is why they fully support the peace-loving Soviet initiatives. The tragic experience of our history and the price paid for the country's freedom and independence remind us that only in alliance with the USSR and all the socialist community countries is it possible to ensure the CSSR's peaceful development.

It can be stated with satisfaction that the USSR's peace-loving proposals are meeting with growing international support. There is a strengthening conviction in the world of the need to resolve international security questions on the basis of the principles proposed by the Soviet Union. This gives us hope that it will be possible to avert the nuclear threat and ensure a peaceful future for mankind, the speaker said in conclusion.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW TV: AMERICANS SUPPORTING GORBACHEV'S PROPOSAL INCREASES

LD180019 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Feb 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; commentary by IZVESTIYA political observer Stanislav Kondrashov]

[Text] The U.S. ABC Television Company and the WASHINGTON POST has carried out a joint public opinion poll. A number of questions concerned reaction to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement of 15 January. The poll revealed that 74 percent of Americans—as against 22 percent—support the Soviet proposals for the elimination of all nuclear weapons by the year 2000. Here is a commentary by Stanislav Kondrashov, political observer of IZVESTIYA:

Over the month and a bit since Comrade Gorbachev's Statement we have all heard and quoted many of the responses from abroad, including, of course, U.S. responses. We now have before us in graphic form the response not of individual persons or press publications, but it would appear of the whole of the American people. The preponderance of Americans who approved the idea of eliminating nuclear weapons by the year 2000 over those who did not approve it is more than triple. This is a noteworthy fact, and even, I would say, striking.

Firstly, it means that the Soviet plan has reached the mass of Americans, which is an achievement in itself. Secondly, it was not discarded as propaganda, as often happens in America with Soviet proposals. On the contrary, 60 percent as against 32 percent, to judge by that same poll, thought that the Soviet Union seriously wants progress in the field of disarmament. The main thing is that the Soviet proposals were approved with such a preponderance.

In analyzing these figures we will not make a naive and enthusiastic song and dance about them. Of course, if the U.S. ship of state were moved directly by the energy of public common sense, the movement toward disarmament would become quicker and shorter. But this is not the case. There is a state machine with its own inertia and interests of ruling groups, but the actual voice of the people speaks in varying tones.

The same poll has shown that Reagan's foreign policy is currently more popular among Americans than at any other time, but the president has still not even given an official answer, or quite such a clearly approving answer as his countrymen, to the Soviet plan. His administration is overcome by sharp



differences of opinion in working out the details of this reply, and so far as the whole, and not the details, is concerned, in Washington they are clearly confused and perplexed by the radical character of Moscow's proposals.

But let us return to the poll again: Reagan's popularity among Americans is a fact which is not new, and is stable. The new thing, as the poll has shown, lies in the fact that Americans, by 63 percent to 27 percent, evaluate positively the activity of the Soviet leader. In the recent period in the United States the thesis of the Soviet threat has somehow become effaced; for about 10 years it was dominant. After the Geneva meeting, 92 percent of Americans are optimistically disposed. Comrades, Geneva is not so much 3 days of meeting at summit level, but rather a new process which was begun there, which is continuing, and one must hope, will continue. The process is stimulated precisely by proposals like those made a month ago. They have an effect both on the international and on the internal U.S. climate.

The same poll has shown that the proportion of those who favor an increase in funding for the Pentagon has gone sharply down, over 5 years, from 72 percent to 22 percent. For those who like me have been observing America for quite a long time it is well known; it is easier for the Pentagon hawks to secure support from Americans when competition between the two countries is acute. Now it is becoming more difficult for the hawks. A forecast can be risked: in November, in the congressional elections, it will be a little easier for those candidates who stand for a reduction in military spending for the sake of reducing the enormous budget deficit. And this will also be a development of the Geneva process if it proves possible to maintain it. Public opinion in the United States is not the most quickly acting, but is, in the final analysis, the most powerful lever of influence on Washington's policies. It is necessary for this lever to assist with a shift in the right direction.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### IZVESTIYA CITES U.S. CITIZENS' LETTERS TO GORBACHEV

PM121443 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Koryavin report: "Peace for Planet Earth: Americans' Letters to M. S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] Washington--How to uphold peace, stop the arms race, and save mankind from lethal nuclear arsenals--these questions are today of profound concern to mankind. Millions of people in America too seek answers to them. In numerous letters addressed to M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which are arriving at the USSR Embassy in Washington and other Soviet institutions in the United States, Americans stress that they see in the Soviet peace initiatives realistic ways of averting the nuclear threat and improving the international climate. They find in these initiatives the answer to the people's most cherished aspirations--to uphold peace on earth.

The stream of letters took on a particularly large scale after the publication of the USSR's historic program setting forth realistic and concrete ways of enabling our planet to approach the year 2000 without nuclear weapons. Approving the USSR's peace-loving steps, Americans call on their government to follow its example. There are many letters. Let us quote extracts from just a few. In these letters the authors express an ardent desire for the establishment of peace on earth and the development of Soviet-American cooperation.

Addressing M. S. Gorbachev, Ruben (Tankvist) from Portland writes: "Millions of Americans are deeply grateful to you, Mr M. S. Gorbachev, for your sincere proposal to end the arms race, which carries a threat to all life on our planet.

"It is a pity that our government is so slow to adopt your proposal and begin cooperation to achieve this goal, which guarantees the preservation of life on earth. Moreover the vast resources which are spent on military purposes could save millions of starving people and provide for our planet's deprived inhabitants."

Other Americans express the same ideas. These are the words of (Lourens Dar) from Lexington: "I would like cordially to congratulate you on your recent proposal to destroy all nuclear weapons in the next 15 years. The realization that someone occupying such a lofty position as you can make such a

proposal gives me new strength in my activity in the struggle for peace. I call on President Reagan to join with you in turning your proposal into reality."

"With your appeal to rid the earth of all nuclear weapons in the next 15 years," William Ludlow writes from Philadelphia, "you have given us new hope in our desire for peace. We value your initiative."

William Ludlow, like many other Americans, places high value in his letter on the fact that the Soviet Union unilaterally decided to extend the moratorium on nuclear weapon tests. He calls on the American Government to follow the Soviet country's example in this too so as to take the first steps on the path of ridding the earth of nuclear arsenals. "We value," he stresses, "your initiative and your sense of responsibility, expressed in the extension of the moratorium on nuclear weapon tests." "I welcome," D. Freeborn from Oregon stresses, "your decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear tests. The idea of on-site inspections undoubtedly makes an accord on the banning of nuclear tests more attainable. I am deeply grateful to you for your initiative. In this sphere the time has come for us to pool our efforts in order to make the world stable and secure."

"Esteemed Mr Gorbachev, I would like to thank you and the Soviet Government for stopping all nuclear explosions," Paulette Finnegan from Illinois writes. "It is a pity that the United States has not yet reciprocated and taken similar steps. I want to assure you that the majority of American citizens want lasting peace and regard the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions as a giant step in that direction. My friends and I will do everything possible to make our administration join in the moratorium."

The same thoughts permeate the messages from John Fausett, from California; Lena (Feygen), from Massachusetts; (Trevis Messerli), from Nebraska; Peter Wilk, from Maine; Frank (Meyyer), from New Jersey; and many other U.S. inhabitants.

The Americans' letters express deep concern about the plans being implemented by the United States to step up the creation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) or the "Star Wars" program. While the Soviet Union is taking on a pledge not to test nuclear charges, the American side is continuing tests in Nevada. The dangerous course of militarizing outer space continues.

The Americans express their agreement with the words of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to the effect that the prevention of the transfer of the arms race to space is seen by the USSR as a fundamental condition for the preservation of mankind. "You have undoubtedly put forward sensible proposals, Mr Gorbachev," Mary Bolton writes from Portland, "and we can only hope that in the course of talks the United States will become convinced that it must renounce the strategic defense initiative. There are many among us Americans who constantly appeal to our leaders and point to the danger inherent in the SDI plans."

The theme of condemnation of the space militarization plans also permeates David (Grout's) letter from South Carolina: "I am also an opponent of the SDI plans. Its implementation would cost us trillions of dollars and would mean a sharp increase in taxes, since we cannot oppose the laws which will shift the burden of expenditure on today's space plans onto us and our children."

Americans come out in favor of improving relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. They believe that both countries, despite differences in their social systems, have every opportunity to coexist. Time has demonstrated this, and especially the cooperation between our two countries in the difficult years of World War II. Americans welcome the Geneva summit meeting and the forthcoming visits by M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the United States and President R. Reagan to the Soviet Union. The idea that the USSR and the United States have no alternative but to live in conditions of detente and peaceful coexistence is contained in many of the letters. "Despite the fact that I do not share communist views, I believe that the recent proposals by M. S. Gorbachev and the USSR Government on disarmament issues are positive and sincere and merit an attentive and serious attitude on the part of our leadership. I am in favor of peaceful cooperations and I do not approve the U.S. military circles' militarist policy," Juan Rios from Florida stresses.

The stream of letters arriving at Soviet institutions in the United States, addressed to M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is endless. Americans welcome the Soviet peace initiatives which he put forward and welcome the USSR's peace-loving steps, aimed at improving the international climate and at peaceful cooperation between the two great powers.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### USSR VIEWS 'EUROPEAN ASPECT' OF GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

PM041111 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[Captain 2d Rank V. Kuzar "Military-Political Review": "Europe's Special Mission"]

[Text] A substantial part of the new Soviet initiatives directly concerns Europe, the statement by M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee emphasizes. And this is no accident. The interrelation and interwovenness of the peoples' destinies, despite the fact that they follow different paths of social development, is felt particularly forcefully on the European continent. Because of its geographical density and over-saturation with arms, Europe is more vulnerable than any other continent in the event of an armed conflict, not to mention a nuclear conflict. Yet it is precisely here that all preconditions now exist for overcoming the differences between East and West, especially as regards questions of security and mutually advantageous cooperation.

What does the European aspect of the comprehensive Soviet peace program consist of? What must be done to arrest the development of events which is resulting in the continuous deterioration of the security situation in Europe as time goes by? How can this Gordian knot be cut? A precise and clear answer is given to all these questions.

As a first realistic step, the Soviet Union proposes eliminating all Soviet and U.S. medium-range ballistic and cruise missiles in the European zone. It is no secret that the appearance on the continent of U.S. first-strike nuclear missile systems was the main cause of a sharp exacerbation of the situation not just in Europe but in the world as a whole and that it is precisely these weapons which have maximized the threat of an all-consuming war. And as long as these weapons are in Europe that threat of nuclear war breaking out--even granted that no one wants it--will remain.

This is why eliminating Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles from the European continent is an urgent necessity. This would resolve one of the most complex problems of international politics today and would greatly help to pave the way to a radical reduction of nuclear weapons and their subsequent complete elimination. The United States would, of course, have to pledge from the outset not to supply its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries,



while Britain and France would have to pledge not to build up their corresponding nuclear arms.

Subsequently, during the second and third stages, other specific steps would be taken involving all nuclear states and aimed at freezing, reducing, and completely eliminating all nuclear arms. Thus, by the year 2000 not just Europe but the whole planet would be free of these mass destruction weapons.

However, Europe could set an example not only in the elimination of nuclear arms. The Soviet Union regards as quite feasible the task of also completely eliminating, within this century, the utterly barbaric chemical weapons. It is known that a vast quantity of super-toxic U.S. nerve gas is stored in West Germany. According to specialists' estimates there is enough to kill the entire population of Europe several times over. The danger of chemical war in Europe has been further intensified by plans being hatched by the Pentagon to site binary weapons here. The socialist countries favor the complete elimination of chemical weapons from Europe. The practical solution of this problem would be greatly facilitated by implementing the proposal put forward by the GDR and Czechoslovakia to create a chemical weapon-free zone in Central Europe.

Our country further proposes that conventional arms and armed forces be subjected to agreed reductions. The beginning of this process could be signaled by a decision to reduce Soviet and U.S. forces and subsequently to freeze the level of groupings confronting each other in the center of Europe. Talks on this subject have been in progress in Vienna for years. The USSR and its Warsaw Pact allies are full of determination to achieve success at these talks. The new Soviet peace-loving foreign policy initiatives also create the preconditions necessary for a successful solution of tasks at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building and Security Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

Security in Europe can no longer be ensured by military means, by military force. This is an indisputable fact, a political axiom. Deeply aware of this, the Soviet Union is again displaying a bold, creative approach, innovative thinking, and utmost responsibility for peoples' destinies. This is why the new Soviet proposals and initiatives accord with the aspirations of most Europeans and all the peace-loving peoples of our planet. The progressive West European press points out that, were we to avail ourselves of the opportunities opened up by the Soviet initiatives, we could cut through the Gordian knot formed by European security issues.

In this context the following question arises: How did the circles which determine state policy in West European countries and shape NATO's overall strategy react to the Soviet proposals? "We will examine...", "We will take note of...", "We are studying..."—these are the utterances that can be heard in West European capitals today. It is necessary, of course, to study them, and that takes a certain length of time. Nonetheless, one would like to ask how long it will take. After all, time does not stand still. It is essential to overcome more swiftly the notorious inertia which affects thinking and to stop it from lagging behind what is happening in a world rapidly changing before our eyes.

This is all the more necessary because there is no shortage of enemies and opponents of disarmament in NATO countries, and convinced and stubborn opponents at that. They are conducting a provocative campaign with the aim of undermining confidence in the comprehensive Soviet peace program and downgrading its significance. Here is just one typical example of their black deeds. A certain Lellouche, associate director of the French Institute for International Relations, writes in NEWSWEEK: "It would be incorrect to interpret the new Soviet plan for nuclear disarmament simply as just another propaganda trick. It is a subtle blow delivered by the psychological warfare apparatus and aimed at the very foundations of the Western alliance's security system in Europe." Clearly, this is an obvious attempt to misrepresent the essence of the Soviet initiatives, to mislead the European and the world public, and to conceal own militarist plans.

In the meantime the buildup of the U.S. nuclear potential in Europe continues. The deployment of cruise missiles in Britain is proceeding at full speed. The first launch installations for these weapons have been delivered ahead of schedule to the FRG, where the Pershing-2 missiles are already fully deployed. Moreover, there are not 108 of them, as specified in NATO's well-known "two-track decision," but almost three times as many, according to the Western press. The Netherlands and Belgium are getting ready to receive cruise missiles.

In accordance with a plan drawn up by General Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander, Europe, a large-scale modernization of U.S. tactical nuclear weapons is being implemented. Around 7,000 rounds of nuclear ammunition are stored at approximately 150 sites in West Europe. Now certain obsolete types of these weapons are being replaced by new ones. Thus in 1985 more than 100 nuclear shells for 203.2mm guns were manufactured in the United States specifically for Europe. New 155mm nuclear shells are also arriving in Europe. It is planned to modernize Lance nuclear missiles, which have a range of up to 60 miles, and to develop completely new nuclear missiles with a range of 250 miles.

Advocating an accelerated buildup of the latest nuclear weapon systems in West Europe, General Rogers appealed to the Washington administration a few days ago not to agree under any circumstances to the Soviet proposal to completely eliminate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles during the first stage. This "would weaken the U.S. strategic nuclear umbrella," he stated frankly.

Britain and France have also embarked in earnest on programs to build up their nuclear potentials. According to the NEW YORK TIMES, London, for instance, intends to equip 4 submarines with 64 new Chevaline missiles, each of which can be fitted with two nuclear warheads. Later these submarines are to be replaced by four new ones, each fitted with 16 Trident-2 missiles bought in the United States. According to specialists, each such missile will be fitted with eight individually targeted warheads. Thus Britain is planning to have a total of 512 warheads on submarine-based missiles by 1990. At the same time it is replacing obsolete bombers with nuclear-capable Tornado aircraft.

As for France, it has already started to equip its submarines with missiles fitted with multiple warheads. The submarine "L'inflexible," with 16 missiles on board fitted with six warheads each, has joined the fleet. As a result the submarine-based nuclear missile arsenal has doubled at one fell swoop. At least five more submarines are to be fitted with these missiles. In addition, France has 18 land-based missiles and is studying the question of developing a new mobile missile. France is also preparing to include air-to-surface nuclear missiles in its arsenal, using Mirage-2000 aircraft as the delivery vehicle.

As you can see, the British and French nuclear potential is not as small as the West would have it. Moreover, if we take into account the more than 1,000 warheads to be added, then the European nuclear might well increase immeasurably. This is why it is so important to resolve the question of freezing these two countries' nuclear forces while Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles are being eliminated.

Despite sensible arguments to the contrary and despite the West European population's broad support for the Soviet peace initiatives, the militarists continue to build up the stockpiles of nuclear weapons on the European continent.

A real obstacle to strengthening security in Europe and throughout the world and to eliminating nuclear weapons would be the implementation of the U.S. "Star Wars" plans. The Soviet Union has declared with utmost responsibility that it is possible to deliver the planet from nuclear weapons only if the militarization of space is prevented. However, the U.S. industrial-military complex bosses are persistently trying to find loopholes and by-passes leading to the creation of space strike weapons. And they are being helped in this by West European armament factories, above all in Britain, the FRG, and Italy.

Involvement in the "Star Wars" plans is being covered up by demagogical claims about a "space shield" being created by the United States, allegedly capable of protecting West Europe. This mendacious demagoguery is totally worthless. Achieving world domination via space and creating the preconditions for a first strike--that is the true purpose of the U.S. SDI program. It has nothing in common with ensuring security either in the world as a whole, in Europe in particular.

Europe, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement says, "could have a special mission to perform in achieving a sharp turn in favor of the policy of peace. That mission is to build a new edifice of detente." In recent days the Stockholm conference has resumed its work and new rounds of talks have opened in Geneva and Vienna. The peoples are expecting a constructive approach to the comprehensive Soviet peace program, specific accords to end the arms race on earth and to prevent it in space, a lowering of the level of military confrontation in Europe, and the establishment of mutual confidence and security. This is the way to lay firm foundations for an all-European edifice of detente.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### USSR LITERARY PAPER ASSAILS NEWSWEEK ARTICLE ON ARMS PROPOSAL

PH251535 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Feb 86 p 9

[Fedor Burlatskiy "Political Observer's Notes": "Intoxicated With Military Technology"]

[Text] After the first wave of largely favorable commentaries on M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement, a second wave surged up in the United States and other Western countries, bringing barely concealed icebergs and fully visible reefs of objections, doubts, and fear in the face of the very possibility of stopping the arms race, let alone starting a process leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

An article in NEWSWEEK magazine is typical in this regard. The magazine often takes positions that are perhaps less extremist than many other American weeklies. Often, but not this time. The journal has published an article by Pierre Lelouche, assistant director of the French Institute of International Relations. It says:

"It would be incorrect to regard the new Soviet nuclear disarmament plan as simply the latest propaganda trick. It is a sophisticated blow by the political warfare apparatus, directed against the very foundation of the security system of the Western alliance in Europe. As such, it should be regarded as the diplomatic equivalent of multiple-warhead missiles."

Collect yourself, Mr Lelouche. How can you totally disregard common sense? After all, we are proposing the elimination of not only American, not only Western nuclear weapons, but our own, too. Any and all nuclear weapons, whoever they belong to. And we propose to do this not all at once, but by stages. Moreover, in the first stage it is planned to eliminate only the Soviet and American potential of medium-range missiles that exist in Europe. As for the French and British nuclear potential, at this stage it will remain unaffected. The only condition that is set is to stop the process of modernization and further stockpiling of these weapons. What is so terrible about that for France and Britain, if they are prepared to support the idea of nuclear disarmament in general?

But let us listen to the magazine's arguments. "The most powerful diplomatic warhead is targeted on the United States. Three years ago Ronald Reagan imprudently (?) expounded to the whole world his idea of a world free from nuclear weapons: A space defense shield, he pointed out, will make nuclear weapons unnecessary and obsolete. Now M.S. Gorbachev is simply using the same antinuclear arguments as a boomerang."

The same arguments? Oh no! First, the question of a world without nuclear weapons, a world without wars, was raised for the first time not by the U.S. leaders, but by



our country's government a quarter of a century ago. Second, M.S. Gorbachev -- and everyone is well aware of this -- proposes to eliminate nuclear arms not as well as, but instead of implementing a space arms program.

"The second and third diplomatic warheads are targeted on the Europeans, and first and foremost the nuclear countries (France and Britain), and then on their nonnuclear neighbors. This blow could prove even more crushing for Western security interests." Why? Because "without the nuclear component, NATO would rapidly become an empty shell, and Europe would still have to oppose Soviet non-nuclear forces, which greatly exceed Europe's in numerical strength, and, of course, nuclear forces, and moreover in the absence of an American nuclear shield."

Not a word that is not a distortion and misrepresentation of the facts. Why should Europe have to oppose nuclear forces, when it is a question of eliminating nuclear potential on both sides -- East and West? Who has proved that the NATO joint forces (not only West European, but American too, of course) are "greatly" inferior to the Warsaw Pact forces? And how is it possible to ignore the new proposals contained in the statement about reducing conventional arms on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security?

The secret of such Western views is simple: They are intoxicated with the new technology, which opens up fantastic possibilities for a new round in the arms race -- on earth and, this time, in space, too.

But intoxication is the worst counselor in politics. What is needed is a realistic assessment of the common threat and joint efforts to overcome it. The Soviet public is waiting for the White House after soberly considering all the facts, to give a constructive response to the proposals set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's statement. In order to advance the process of limiting the arms race that began with the treaties banning weapons tests in the three environments, the ABM Treaty, and other agreements of the sixties and seventies.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274



## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### MOSCOW DENIES USSR DRIVING WEDGE BETWEEN U.S., ALLIES

LD281000 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] The American newspaper **NEWSDAY**, commenting on Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on disarmament problems, says that the Soviet leader's position, in the opinion of American officials, has been almost driving a wedge between the United States and its allies. Here's a comment on this from Edgar Rostov, and this is what he writes:

The argument about a wedge, which Moscow is supposedly trying to drive in between the American leader and his partners, is (?not the) intention of **NEWSDAY**. Significantly, Washington begins talking of a sinister Russian wedge every time Moscow comes up with new peace initiatives. The American leadership promptly begins examining such initiatives, not on their own merits, not their substance, but from the angle of the extent to which these initiatives can earn the trust of America's partners and cause them to take a critical view of the policy of their Transatlantic leader.

Washington is clearly displeased that the Gorbachev plan harmonizes with East European calls to curb the arms race and remove the threat of self-destruction looming over humanity.

I would also like to point out in this context that some of the new Soviet initiatives are in fact directly addressed to Europe. Indeed, Europe has a special part to play, a mission of bringing back relaxation, in achieving a radical change in favor of peace in world affairs. Still, let's face the question. Are the Russians really driving a wedge between the United States and its partners? This requires that we first consider what it is the Soviet Union is proposing. What we propose is that during the first stage of disarmament, that is within 5 to 8 years, the Soviet Union and the United States should halve their nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory. Moscow considers such a reduction feasible only if both countries renounce the development, testing and deployment of space strike weapons.

We are also in favour of completely abolishing Soviet and American intermediate-range missiles in the European zone and the United States must undertake not to supply its strategic or intermediate missiles to other countries, and Britain and France not to increase their nuclear armories. At the second stage the nuclear disarmament process should be joined by the other nuclear

powers. At first they would undertake to freeze all their nuclear arms and not to maintain such arms on the territory of other countries. This, of course, has a direct bearing upon West Europe and, specifically, upon Britain. Then all the nuclear powers would abolish their tactical nuclear weapons. At that stage the Soviet-American ban on space strike weapons would have to become multilateral with the mandatory participation in it of all the major industrial powers.

It's also an important Soviet condition that, first, the USSR and the United States and then all the nuclear powers should stop the testing of nuclear weapons. Moscow has in fact extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions for another 3 months. How will the West react to the Soviet invitation to join this moratorium? A letter writer in THE TIMES believes that this invitation is embarrassing to Washington and London since they are continuing to perfect their nuclear warheads. The Soviet Union is also prepared to accept on-site inspection and this disposes of what the West considered to be the most important objection to concluding an agreement on a test ban. All this, in view of THE TIMES, has put the United States and Britain in a spot from the moral standpoint.

The United States Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger now claims that the abolition of American nuclear weapons in Western Europe would be extremely dangerous. Dangerous to whom? To the Pentagon strategists who view Europe as a (?theater) of war, as a territory for a limited nuclear conflict? It's for this reason that THE TIMES, since the start of the deployment of the new Pershings and cruise missiles, has seen the relations between the United States and its Atlantic allies become strained. They have been further strained by Washington's determination to incorporate its partners in its "Star Wars" program. But surely that's the obvious conclusion from the fact that, persuasion notwithstanding, no one else in Western Europe had followed the example of London and Bonn. Who, then is really driving a wedge between the United States and its partners?

The Gorbachev plan threatens no one's security, neither America's nor Western Europe. It has the aim of ridding the world of nuclear weapons, and Washington's talk about the Russians driving a wedge is to my mind, writes Edgar Rostov, an indirect admission of the attractive nature of the Soviet initiatives for America's West European partners.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: PETROVSKIY BOOK ON NUCLEAR AGE, ARMS CONTROL REVIEWED

FM100945 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[A. Ivkin book review under the rubric "Bookshelf" entitled: "Averting the Threat"]

[Text] Acquiring tremendous power over the forces of nature as a result of the scientific and technical revolution, mankind has, at the same time, come face to face with the threat of self-destruction. Meanwhile, man's conquest of atomic energy and of space could be a boon to all peoples. However, because of the policy of imperialist powers, and primarily the United States, these events have led to the intensification of an unprecedented threat which hangs over the earth's civilization. Is this Damocles' Sword destined to fall on us?—diplomat and historian V. F. Petrovskiy asks in his recently published book\*.

In other words, "will there, or will there not, be a nuclear war?" It is not possible to give an unequivocal answer to this question. The author's reasoning that in view of the currently prevailing military-strategic parity the only guarantee for each state's security is their mutual, collective security is convincing. The recognition of this postulate which was reflected in the Soviet-American joint statement at the Geneva summit enables us to believe that the probability of nuclear war being averted is greater than the probability of it breaking out. However, the threat of war remains. The reason for this is the stubborn unwillingness of the U.S. military-industrial complex and the Washington administration to renounce the implementation of its "Star Wars" program.

Sometimes it is "only the man" giving vent to his emotions, who addresses the reader of the book. But for the most part we follow the reasoning a specialist who is thoroughly familiar with the machinery of diplomacy. [as received] He analyzes in detail the system of security guarantees, disarmament measures, the role of the United Nations, international negotiations, states' unilateral and multilateral actions, and also the impact of public forces on the consolidation of security.

\*V. F. Petrovskiy: "Security in the Nuclear and Space Age" [Bezopasnost v Yaderno-kosmicheskuyu Eru] Moscow, International Relations Publishing House, 1985].

The book devotes much space to the USSR's consistent struggle for arms limitation and reduction and for disarmament. This struggle is dictated by a sense of the utmost responsibility of the CPSU and the Soviet state for the fate of mankind and its peaceful future. The new Soviet peace initiatives put forward in the 15 January Statement of M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, have also been dictated by awareness of this responsibility. The conclusion that there is no need for us to resign ourselves to the inevitability of war is comprehensively substantiated in the book. Peoples' desire for peace, awareness of the tremendous responsibility for the decisions they make on the part of all states' political leaders, and efforts to bring political thinking in line with the realities of the nuclear and space age are capable—and the book convinces us of this—to prevent the planet from being driven to the point "of no return."

/9274

CSO: S200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### USSR'S YURIY ZHUKOV COMMENTS ON CONTROL STRUGGLE

PM251606 London MORNING STAR in English 24 Feb 86 p 2

[Interview with Soviet Peace Committee chairman Yuriy Zhukov by Kate Clark: "Mass Action Can Stop Nuclear Armageddon" -- date, place not given]

[Text] "If Reagan had come out with peace initiatives like the latest Soviet ones, we would have come out in active support of them.

"We wouldn't have been afraid of being labelled pro-American," Soviet Peace Committee chairman Yuriy Zhukov said.

"It doesn't matter where the proposals come from, you have to look at what's in them," he stressed.

Yuriy Zhukov is one of the Soviet Union's leading peace campaigners. One of the delegates to the first post-war Peace congress in Paris organised by Joliot Curie and Professor I.D. Bernal, among others, he has seen the world get progressively more dangerous since then.

And like many of his generation. He feels the urgency of stopping the mad rush to Armageddon. "There are less than two months left till the end of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests," he told me earlier this month.

Labor shadow foreign secretary Denis Healey's reaction to the Soviet disarmament proposals has been very positive, Mr Zhukov said.

Mr Healey told NEW TIMES this month: "What often happens in proposals is the fact that they contain objectives which everyone can agree with but no one knows how to reach.

"What is good about the Gorbachev proposals is that the most convincing proposals are those in the first phase and there are also proposals which go further toward meeting the concerns of the Western European countries than earlier versions," Mr Healey said. NEW TIMES reported Mr Healey as saying the Labour Party wanted to see a rapid agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty. "We welcome the extension of the Soviet moratorium," he said, "to give more time for this question to be discussed among the western powers."

Mr Zhukov said: "We in the Soviet peace movement were in favour of prolonging the Soviet government's moratorium -- and so we supported the Soviet decision at the beginning of the year to extend it until the end of March."



But Mr Zhukov said that it is not enough for individual leaders to come out in favor of the Soviet disarmament proposals. "What is needed is mobilisation of the mass of the people," he stressed.

"Last October we organised thousands of meetings and demonstrations under our slogans: 'No to nuclear weapons in Europe, West or East, no to nuclear weapons everywhere!'

"We're against Soviet missiles, American missiles, British, Chinese and French missiles!

"Fifty-six million Soviet people took part in these meetings and demonstrations on the streets," he added.

"In January over 17 million Soviet young people sent a letter to President Reagan urging the U.S. to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests, and calling for resumption of the U.S.-British-Soviet tripartite test ban treaty talks."

Urgent actions is also needed, the Soviet Peace Committee chairman said, to put an end to preparations for "star wars". "The other most important question now is the medium-range nuclear weapons deployed in Europe," he went on.

"The proposals announced by Mikhail Gorbachev on January 15 include destruction of both U.S. and Soviet medium-range nuclear missiles deployed in Europe.

"This would be done under strict control," he added. The Soviet Union last year agreed to all control measures, including on-site verification.

"The place of destruction would have to be decided on, and the precise measures of control. The warheads' content would be used for peaceful purposes," he explained. In his talks with Senator Edward Kennedy at the beginning of this month, Mikhail Gorbachev confirmed that the question of getting rid of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe can be solved independently of the question of space weapons.

"This is a very important step," said Mr Zhukov. "It does away with all the prevarications to the effect that the Soviet proposals were not a going proposition since they were conditional on non-militarisation of space when everybody knows the U.S. was not going to give up SDI.

"So here we have a unique chance to solve this problem -- to get rid of medium-range missiles. And I'm sure British people are just as interested in this as we are, since Britain has large numbers of U.S. medium-range weapons deployed on its soil."

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### BOVIN'S VIEWS ON SOVIET PROPOSALS IN HUNGARIAN PAPER

AU251022 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 21 Feb 86 p 2

[Interview with Aleksandr Bovin, "foreign correspondent" of IZVESTIYA, by Moscow correspondent Ferenc Szaniszló: "They Can Trust our Words — Interview with Aleksandr Bovin" — First paragraph is paper's introduction]

[Text] Aleksandr Bovin, foreign correspondent of IZVESTIYA, is one of the most authoritative Soviet publicists. He has represented and made known the Soviet foreign policy stance at forums abroad on several occasions. In the following interview he answers the questions of our accredited Moscow correspondent and analyzes the background of the 15 January Soviet disarmament proposals and their international reception.

[Szaniszló] A complex peace program was published at the time of the 16th CPSU Congress. In your view, what was the reason for announcing the new Soviet proposals a few weeks prior to this congress?

[Bovin] Look, as far as I know there is no rule for only announcing such proposals at a particular time.

If the Politburo considered it correct to announce the disarmament proposals before the congress, why should it not do so? The Constitution does not require that such an important document be made public only at the party congress. In any case, we are talking about thinking creatively, stopping formalism and empty stereotypes. One then should we not publish our peace program prior to the congress? The 16th Party forum will then analyze the international reception of our suggestions and will then add something to them. In other words, there is no point in stressing the wrong time. As people say here, it is not only the church where people can pray.

[Szaniszló] Some people in the West think that the Soviet proposals are more or less the same as President Reagan's zero option.

[Bovin] There is nothing strange about this. If we want to reach some agreement in one way or another our views must coincide. The Americans propose something, then we also put forward our opinion and thus, gradually our positions approach each other. How could we agree if our proposals did not in themselves bear the possibility of compromise? Of course, one must not forget that Reagan's zero option does not say a word about freezing French and British nuclear weapons or about preventing the passing on of nuclear weapons to its allies. In these two fundamental matters the zero option is different from our January proposals.

[Szaniuszlo] Recently, Colonel General Chervov, section head of a directorate of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, and U.S. Senator Kennedy said that in the case of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe progress could be made on the basis of the Soviet proposals. However, according to NATO, even if the Soviet Union dismantles [leszereli] its European missiles, there still remain some medium-range missiles in the Asian region and these could be quickly transported to Europe in the event of a conflict.

[Bovin] Our missiles are found east of the 80th longitude, that is, not exactly behind the Ural mountains. From there they cannot reach Europe. On the other hand, I think, there are technological means available today with which the other side can verify precisely where missiles are deployed. Last, but not least, they can trust our word. These missiles have nothing to do with Europe. They protect our state from the Asian side.

[Szaniuszlo] If it were possible to reach an agreement with China, is it conceivable that these missiles be dismantled?

[Bovin] Why not? This, however, could be the next step, for, as you well know, no other nuclear powers are represented at the Geneva talks. If things get that far, we can talk about this as well. Well, you should not think that we keep missiles in the Asian part of our country out of sheer joy. If agreement is reached, we will be pleased to remove them from there provided, of course, that the forward-based forces of the United States are withdrawn from the area, that the U.S. forces leave Asia, and that agreement is reached with China.

[Szaniuszlo] If everything works out, there will be a new Soviet-U.S. summit in the summer...

[Bovin] No agreement has been reached yet with the Americans on a concrete date for the meeting.

[Szaniuszlo] Let us hope that sooner or later this will also be successful. In Geneva, no significant disarmament agreements were reached. The world expects that the next summit will provide some. However, it seems that Washington does not want to make concessions on the most significant subject, namely, as regards space armament. Is it possible to imagine that because of this the Soviet proposals will become reality only on paper?

[Bovin] Unfortunately, yes. It is also our opinion that even though we can be satisfied with the fact that the two leaders became personally acquainted at the Geneva summit, this will not be enough at the next summit. Of course, they could agree about the question of Euromissiles. In principle, the U.S. side agrees with our proposals. However, as soon as practical steps are required, we are rejected. We say to them: You should give up nuclear testing! Their answer is: We would like to do that, but it would be opposed by the United Kingdom and France; and so on. The same is true in the case of the Strategic Defence Initiative. We are not against basic research or laboratory tests. However, outside laboratory tests are prohibited by the 1972 agreement. If the Americans continue with space armament they could torpedo our 15 January proposals.

[Szaniuszlo] The prolonged Soviet moratorium as regards nuclear tests will expire on 31 March. Is it possible that it will be extended until the next summit?

[Bovín] This depends first of all on the development of U.S. and Soviet military programs. We issued the moratorium unilaterally, even extended it, while they continue with nuclear tests. It is possible that the time will come when the unilateral moratorium negatively affects our security. Only the soldiers can say when such a time comes.

[Szamiszlo] From Stockholm to Geneva and from New York to Vienna, several international forums are dealing with the issues of disarmament, detente, and peace. In light of the new Soviet proposals, what role can be fulfilled by smaller states, by neutral and unaligned countries in promoting the success of such forums?

[Bovín] In my view, the most can be done by the United States and the Soviet Union, because the mightiest nuclear strike force is centralized in their hands. However, I would consider it especially dangerous, clearly inconceivable, if small and medium countries remained passive. After all, if we reach an agreement with the Americans, the whole world will benefit from it. In my view, small and medium states have to strive to influence the United States and the Soviet Union in the direction of agreements. In recent years, the weight of small and medium countries in world politics has increased. This is so, because whereas it is strength that still dominates the international arena, the role of public opinion is increasing. At various forums the weight of the position, opinion, and activity of small and medium states is already being felt.

[Szamiszlo] Back to the January proposals, what do you think about the way they have been officially received in the West?

[Bovín] Well, as far as the Americans are concerned -- since they are most affected -- we have not as yet received any answer. Obviously, their answer will be some kind of formula of "agreement in principal," but concerning concrete problems, we will probably receive a rejection. It is assumed that the West European allies will react likewise. It is expected that the answer of the United Kingdom and France will be: "We agree with your proposals, but first you and the Americans should reduce the number of nuclear weapons by 50 percent and during that time we continue to further develop our nuclear potentials." Look, I am convinced that we cannot count on rapid and positive results. We cannot delude ourselves with false hopes. The matter is very difficult, extremely difficult, and it could easily happen that as long as Reagan is the tenant in the White House, absolutely no agreement can be reached.

[Szamiszlo] Are you personally an optimist as regards the future of mankind? In fact, what do you think about the turning of the millennium?

[Bovín] I am neither an optimist nor a pessimist. Rather, I would say, I am a realist. I think, there will be nuclear weapons on earth even during the turn of the millennium. We are living in an age when mankind is able to annihilate itself. Some of the scientists understand this, but we cannot say the same about politicians and soldiers. Many of them think as if there were no mass destruction weapons. For example, Reagan agrees in words that a possible nuclear war cannot be won, but he cannot seem to comprehend that as long as people sit on the throne of a pile of weapons, we cannot speak about security. I believe that those people who created weapons can also destroy them.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## **U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS**

### **USSR'S ARBATOV OUTLINES DISARMAMENT POLICY IN INTERVIEW**

**AU251331 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 24 Feb 86 p 6**

[Report on interview given by Georgiy Arbatov, "Director of the Institute for the United States and Canada at the USSR Academy of Sciences," to RABOTNICHESKO DELO reporter Dimitur Gornenski in Moscow on 23 February]

[Text] Despite his tremendous activity as a scientist and public figure, especially after his election as delegate to the 27th CPSU Congress, Academician Georgiy Arbatov found time for a lengthy conversation. I asked him to present his opinions on the essence of the Soviet program for solving the acute problems of international relations, among which disarmament has a central place.

Our party is approaching its 27th Congress with many new ideas, academician Georgiy Arbatov stressed at the beginning. They are connected with ripe and important issues of social development, and are characterized by their deep realism. Precisely this causes the great interest in the forthcoming forum of the Soviet Communists, not only in our country and the socialist countries, but throughout the world. These ideas encompass the topical tasks in improving Soviet society and in international relations.

Foreign policy issues will occupy an important place in the report and other congress documents. Without discussing them ahead of time, I shall dwell on some principled tenets of our policy's development. The peaceful initiatives included in the declaration of Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev on 15 January 1986 give us the basis for this policy. These initiatives pose in a new manner the urgent issues of disarmament, and first of all -- the liquidation of the nuclear weapons and all means of mass destruction. They contain profound insight on the topical issues and a principled new approach to their solution. They create a natural concretization of the new concept of the system of international security, developed by Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev in his speech at the French Parliament in October 1985, at the USSR-U.S. Geneva summit, and in many other speeches, reports, and interviews.

The essence of this concept is based on the understanding that in our time it is impossible to base security upon military power, or upon increasing military power with a view to reaching military superiority. International security is a political task, and it must be solved through political means. This requires a complete reconstruction of the international relations system and renunciation of many forms of foreign policy behavior, such as conducting wars, applying military power to the arms race, and so forth.



For a long time the West used to conceive or rather present all Soviet proposals and initiatives as propaganda. They used to do so even when our unilateral decisions were announced, such as the moratorium on all experiments with nuclear weapons. However, it is increasingly difficult to explain such an attitude. Recently we notice that a change has emerged, and that the very tone of reaction is different. Now they begin with declarations that they are going to study our initiatives carefully. True, they study them for a long time and the result is not always in the form of constructive counterproposals, which the USSR is ready to review and discuss. In this context it is important to point out that we have never viewed our proposals as an ultimatum. We have always expressed our readiness to discuss the ideas and opinions of the other side.

The readers of *RABOTNICHESKO DELO* are familiar with the contents of the Soviet proposals included in the declaration of Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev. This is a concrete plan for liquidating all nuclear weapons in several stages within 15 years. This is not an abstract idea but a complex of concrete proposals.

The first stage includes important steps not connected with the other parts of the program, including the problem of renouncing military activity in space, namely: to liquidate the medium-range U.S. and USSR missiles in Europe and stop nuclear experiments, beginning steps for their total banning. These steps are very important in themselves. There are no obstacles to their implementation. For instance, when we announced our moratorium on nuclear experiments, the United States stressed as an obstacle to joining us the fact that the Soviet Union had conducted more such experiments than the United States. This was not true, but anyway, its pretext is no longer valid because in the meantime the United States conducted a whole series of nuclear experiments. It also stressed the issue of control, despite the fact that science has proven that even the least powerful nuclear explosions can be registered by the existing national technological means. We agreed to all possible means of control; thus this argument fell too. The road toward reaching the necessary agreements is free, as far as we are concerned, provided the United States really wants that on which it insists.

Bilateral readiness for negotiating on these issues was expressed by the foreign ministers of the USSR and the United States in January 1985, and it was confirmed at the Geneva summit. Mutual agreement on the necessity of stopping the arms race was declared. The renunciation of all nuclear experiments is precisely such a step. Furthermore, it is an exceptionally important step because these experiments are a constantly operative factor for intensifying the arms race and they constitute the basis for creating new systems of nuclear weapons. They are connected with the qualitative development of the nuclear arsenals, something which is far more dangerous than their quantitative increase. This measure is closely related to the barriers against the proliferation of nuclear weapons, especially if all other states join it.

As far as the proposal to liquidate the U.S. and USSR medium-range missiles is concerned, there can be no doubt that its implementation will seriously decrease tension and the degree of nuclear danger. It is well known that the program envisages during the first stage a 50-percent reduction in the USSR and U.S. nuclear means capable of reaching the territory of the other state, under the binding condition of refraining from all actions aimed at militarizing space. The second stage presupposes further steps in this direction and the incorporation of other states in the process. The final goal is that mankind enter the 21st century free forever from the nightmare of nuclear weapons. It is also important to stress that the complex of measures also envisages the liquidation of other kinds of weapons, some of which already approach

the means of mass destruction in their power and ability to inflict damage. Otherwise, as Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev said in his interview in L'HUMANITE, the arms race would be transferred to another level.

This is a principled new approach in its entirety. The complex of Soviet proposals is based on statesmanlike thought of a new type, which corresponds with the reality of our nuclear century. The USSR views with understanding many questions posed by the West. By this it manifests political courage and determination and rejects all obstacles which have been traditionally erected on the road toward reaching agreements.

Public opinion in the West and throughout the world greets the new Soviet proposals with understanding and approval, regardless of the obstacles created so that their essence could not reach the consciousness of the popular masses. This complex peace program strengthens the new currents in developing international relations. The documents that the 27th CPSU Congress is going to adopt will be an even more powerful stimulus in increasing the positive trends in international life. However, we know that we face a difficult struggle for their implementation against those circles which do not find it advantageous to allow such a development. We are ready for this struggle which we shall conduct together with our friends in the socialist community and all peace-loving forces throughout the world.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### BRIEFS

U.S. RESPONDS TO GORBACHEV INITIATIVE--Geneva, 24 Feb (TASS)--A plenary meeting of the delegations of the USSR and the USA has been held in the afternoon today at the talks on nuclear and space weapons at the request of the American side. In the course of the meeting the U.S. delegation expressed considerations which were presented by it as a reply to the detailed proposals tabled by the Soviet delegation on 16 January in accordance with the nuclear disarmament programme. This programme is contained in the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, of 15 January 1986. A meeting of the group for medium-range nuclear weapons has also been held here today at the request of the U.S. side within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 24 Feb 86 LD] /9274

PRAVDA CITES CEAUSESCU ON GORBACHEV STATEMENT--Bucharest, 22 Feb--The new Soviet proposals put forward in the statement by M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, are of great international significance and play an important role in the struggle for peace and disarmament. This was stated by N. Ceausescu, secretary general of the RCP and president of Romania, at a session of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee. Now, the Romanian leader noted, it is necessary to do everything possible to ensure that the USSR's foreign policy initiative, which are aimed at eliminating nuclear weapons, are put into practice. We should strive persistently for the implementation of universal disarmament, the elimination of the threat of nuclear catastrophe, and the establishment of a climate of detente, cooperation, and peace. Romania, together with the other socialist countries and progressive and peace-loving forces, will act in that direction. [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 86 First Edition p 4] /9274

CSO: 5200/1274

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### U.S. URGED TO REAFFIRM SUPPORT FOR EUROPE'S NUCLEAR DEFENSES

London SUNDAY TELEGRAPH in English 16 Feb 86 p 16

[Text]

**T**HE Western alliance is clearly caught up in another tangle over its nuclear policy and once again the nimble-footed Mr Gorbachev has stepped forward to try to make Nato's confusion worse confounded. The new alarm was sounded for America's European allies last week by President Reagan's statement that an "agreement" on medium-range missiles (such as cruise) might be reached with the Soviet Union by the end of the year. The five countries (Britain, West Germany, Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands) who either have installed or are expected to instal these missiles after considerable struggles with public opinion were surprised by the nature of the forecast: but they were even more taken aback by the fact that President Reagan had given them no inkling as to how it might be fulfilled.

On top of this, Britain and France, who also possess small strategic nuclear arsenals of their own, were concerned by Soviet suggestions that their entire nuclear forces might be frozen at present levels as part of the price of an overall agreement between

East and West. This would, for example, preclude Britain arming herself as she has pledged with the new generation of Trident submarine weapons. And, seeing another opening to divide the alliance, Mr Gorbachev has come forward with dark hints that, unless agreement could be reached on these medium-range weapons, there was not much point in holding another summit.

President Reagan's yearning to leave office and enter history as the great peacemaker, a label which he can only achieve by successful summitry, is at the root of the Western predicament. No one disputes the sincerity of his motives nor the grandeur of his goals. But an old man in a hurry to achieve immortality within the next two years is a vulnerable interlocutor for the Western case. Part of that case is that Europe's own nuclear defences should not be tampered with until the two super-powers have first agreed on the satisfactory reduction of their own arsenals. It is time for the White House to reaffirm that this proposition still holds.

/12828

CSO: 5240/031

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### BRIEFS

LABOUR PARTY POLICY--Labour intended to remove nuclear weapons from Britain as soon as it came to power, Mr Kinnock, the party leader, told the Dutch Labour party conference yesterday. To enthusiastic applause, he suggested that the Netherlands' treaty with America, agreeing to deploy 48 nuclear missiles on Dutch soil before the end of 1988, was not democratic. The treaty is to be debated by the Dutch lower house before ratification can take place. The Dutch Labour party, which has a majority in the lower house but remains in opposition, is expected to gain more seats in next May's election, and nuclear deployment remains a controversial issue for the Centre Right coalition Government. [Text] [London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 13 Feb 86 p 36] /12828

CSU: 5240/031



## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### USSR ARMY PAPER ON U.S. RELUCTANCE TO JOIN MORATORIUM

PM042005 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Lukin article: "Groundless Arguments: The United States Still Refuses to End Nuclear Tests"]

[Text] At the beginning of 1986 the entire world public witnessed an event of tremendous significance--the Soviet Union, faithful to its peace-loving policy, put forward a radical and comprehensive program to rid mankind of the threat of nuclear war. It proposed a strictly regulated and well balanced plan for the complete and ubiquitous phased elimination of nuclear armaments--from strategic and medium-range to tactical armaments--with a ban on the creation [sозdaniye], testing, and deployment of strike space arms.

The banning of any nuclear explosions is to be the initial step for the realization of this task of worldwide significance. For the USSR and the United States it would come into force from the very outset and the definitive cessation of nuclear tests by all countries possessing such weapons would be achieved at the beginning of the second stage of nuclear disarmament proposed by the USSR.

The need for a ban to be imposed on such tests needs no special proof. According to Western press reports around 95 percent of all nuclear tests are now ultimately aimed at verifying [proverka] the quality of newly developed [novo-razrabotannyh] nuclear charges or at seeking ways of creating [sозdaniye] fundamentally new types of nuclear weapons. Thus, the reduction of the nuclear arsenals alone without a test ban would be, in mathematical parlance, a necessary but insufficient condition to realize the formula of nuclear disarmament. The possibility of creating [sозdavat] new and even more dangerous types of nuclear weapons would remain open.

Let us recall that at the end of December 1985 the United States conducted a powerful nuclear explosion codenamed "Goldstone" at the test range in Nevada. It was conducted in the interests of creating [sозdaniye] an x-ray laser with a nuclear trigger--one of the main types of strike weapons intended for deployment in space in accordance with the infamous "star wars" program. The prospects of the creation [sозdaniye] of other types of deadly nuclear weapons are also being researched. In the recent past such investigations in the United States produced the barbarous neutron weapons.

The continuous improvement of nuclear combat charges cannot fail to be reflected in the development [razvitiye] of their delivery vehicles, either. Had it been possible in the early sixties to ban all nuclear tests, including underground tests, as the Soviet Union sought to do, there would not now be such dangerous nuclear armaments as U.S. ICBM's with multiple warheads, cruise missiles, neutron munitions, and so forth.

Undoubtedly, the cessation of nuclear tests would objectively compel the nuclear powers to impart a really practical character to the disarmament process. Because a reliable barrier would thereby be placed in the way of the further qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons. The overwhelming majority of states of the world community advocate the solution of this urgent problem.

The Soviet Union is invariably in the vanguard of the struggle to ban nuclear tests. The introduction of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions from 6 August 1985 through 1 January 1986 and subsequently--after its expiry--the extension of that moratorium by a further 3 months provide evidence of a responsible attitude to the cause of peace and the peoples' security. By its own example the USSR urges that the avalanche of nuclear preparations be halted.

In an age of rapid scientific and technical developments and research it was no easy matter for the Soviet Union to embark on a moratorium. After all, the development [razrabotka], preparation for testing, and the actual testing of nuclear charges is continuing in the United States. Since our moratorium has been in force the United States has conducted seven officially announced nuclear explosions. In fact the number is even higher. If that continues the Soviet Union will not be able to show unilateral restraint with regard to nuclear tests. The higher interests of safeguarding its own security and the security of its allies will not allow the Soviet Union to go beyond certain limits.

Unfortunately, there are no changes to be seen in Washington's negative stance on the question of joining the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions. How does the U.S. Administration back up its "no?" Let us try to examine its so-called "arguments" one after another.

"Argument" one: "A ban on nuclear tests cannot be a substitute for an agreement on limiting the nuclear arsenals." But no one has ever proposed such a substitution. The establishment of a bilateral moratorium and the elaboration of an international treaty on the complete and general banning of nuclear weapons tests in no way excludes the possibility of resolving the problem of preventing the arms race in space and ending it on earth. If the U.S. side really intends to proceed toward ending the nuclear arms race, a mutual moratorium would be a major milestone on the way toward increasing mutual trust and a favorable incentive for positive solutions at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. Even though the moratorium itself cannot resolve the main task--the elimination of the nuclear arsenals--it would however reliably halt their qualitative improvement and help other nuclear powers to rethink their stances on the nuclear test issue.

"Argument" two: "It is pointless to adopt a moratorium since both sides recognize that sooner or later they will have to resume nuclear weapon tests."

This theory of Washington's does not stand up to criticism either. The Soviet Union does not regard the moratorium as a breathing space before embarking on another series of tests, but rather as a means of overcoming the impasse in the arms race limitation process. It is a practical step which forms part of the USSR's nuclear disarmament program through the year 2000 which has been set forth. The USSR proposes that the "logic" of the alleged inevitability of the arms race, which is customary in the West, must be resolutely overcome, a new approach to this problem must be found, and the stone-age way of thinking, when the main concern was to provide oneself with the biggest club or heaviest stone available, must be discarded.

"Argument" three: "When the time comes, and the Russians deem it necessary, they will break their moratorium" (this refers to the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions declared by the USSR in 1958, and also the suspension of nuclear tests by the USSR, the United States, and Britain in 1958-1961).

On 31 March 1958 the Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on tests of all types of atomic and hydrogen weapons. This step was taken in conditions where the United States was considerably ahead of the USSR in nuclear armaments and had carried out twice as many nuclear tests. Ignoring the Soviet initiative, the United States continued its intensive testing of more and more nuclear munitions. While the Soviet moratorium was in operation—during a period of 5 and 1/2 months—the United States tested more than 40 nuclear charges. In these circumstances, the Soviet Union, guided by security interests, was forced to suspend its unilateral moratorium.

Then, in October of the same year, 1958, tripartite talks (USSR, United States, and Britain) on a nuclear test ban opened in Geneva. The talks' participants suspended their nuclear explosions. However, in December 1959 U.S. President D. Eisenhower officially renounced this pledge. And 2 months later, in February 1960, France, a NATO ally of the United States, became a nuclear power and embarked on intensive nuclear tests. In the prevailing situation, the USSR was forced to resume nuclear tests in September 1961. "There were no legal or ethical strictures to make Moscow refrain from nuclear tests in 1961" (Yu. Keroll), one of the leaders of the U.S. Center for Defense Information, has pointed out.

"Argument" four: "Verification [proverka] of a comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban is not feasible."

People in Washington have been talking about the difficulties of verification [kontrol] for many years. Meanwhile it is well known that both the USSR and the United States have sophisticated national technical means of verification [proverka] at their disposal, enabling them to register even low-yield nuclear explosions. According to the U.S. seismologists L.R. Sylos and D.E. (Evernden) of all the arms limitation measures, nuclear explosions best of all lend themselves to reliable verification [poddayvtiya kontolyu]. And the solution of this task is facilitated further under the conditions of a moratorium.

International monitoring [proverka] procedures could provide an additional guarantee of effective verification [kontrol]. In particular, advantage could be taken of the proposal put forward by six states--Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Greece, and Sweden--suggesting that special stations be set up on their territories to monitor [nablyudeniyе] compliance with a test ban accord. Consequently, references to the infeasibility of verification [kontrol] of nuclear tests are groundless. They cannot serve as an obstacle to the establishment of a bilateral (USSR, United States) moratorium on nuclear explosions right now, and a multilateral moratorium with the participation of other nuclear states later.

M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January Statement noted that if a bilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions was established now, proper verification [kontrol] of compliance with the moratorium would be fully guaranteed by national technical means and also by means of international procedures including on-site inspection [inspektsiya] if necessary. The desire to reach agreement on verification [kontrol] measures demonstrates perfectly clearly the USSR's readiness to strive for an end to the arms race.

And finally, "argument" five: "The USSR has to date carried out more explosions than the United States."

Fabrications of this kind pursue the aim of misleading public opinion and justifying the continuation of nuclear tests by the United States. However, the fact that the United States has carried out many more nuclear explosions than the USSR is widely known. Together with its NATO allies, the United States has carried out 50 percent more nuclear tests than the USSR. During the time that the Soviet moratorium has been in operation this gap has increased further in the United States' favor.

Washington's "arguments" have one thing in common, namely the desire to justify its stance and to sidestep the solution of the most urgent issues of the present time, that is averting nuclear war, ending the arms race, and banning nuclear explosions. There are no reasonable arguments against this, nor will there ever be any.

"In order to stop the arms race once and for all and to switch the course of international events to the channel of peaceful development," M.S. Gorbachev has said, "it is necessary for all to act--governments, political parties, and peoples--and act without delay." It is time to embark on the path of responsible decisions which will ensure mankind's future, its very existence.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1273

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### USSR LT GEN MIKHAYLOV HITS U.S. DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR WARHEADS

PM051011 Moscow TRUD in Russian 2 Feb 86 p 3

[Lieutenant General K. Mikhaylov article: "To Halt the Madness of the Century. A 'Third Generation' of Nuclear Ammunition Is Being Developed in the United States"]

[Excerpts] The comprehensive program of measures to eliminate nuclear weapons advanced in the statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, provides further convincing confirmation of the consistent implementation of the Soviet foreign policy strategy of delivering mankind from the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

This program is specific, profoundly humane, and realistic. It poses in a radically new way the very task of ensuring security in the nuclear age and opens up before mankind the possibility of greeting the third millennium beneath peaceful skies and of living without fear of self-destruction. The Soviet program is perfectly feasible if, of course, at the initial stage the United States and, in the future, other nuclear powers display mutual understanding.

One of the exceptionally important elements of the new Soviet initiatives is the ending of nuclear weapon tests--which would make it possible, as a result, to close all channels for improving nuclear weapons and eliminate the possibility of creating [sozdavat] more refined and lethal types of them. The nuclear arms race would be stopped in the most dangerous--qualitative--direction.

In addition, nuclear tests are essentially the only means of trying out ideas and concepts for the development [razvitiye] of fundamentally new varieties of nuclear ammunition. As was the case in the recent past, for example, with neutron weapons. Finally, tests are also conducted for the purpose of verifying the qualitative state of nuclear ammunition in the arsenal and determining its reliability, which, as a Pentagon document states, must be "at a level to merit confidence."



The continuous U.S. Development [razrabotka] of new nuclear ammunition in turn stimulates the development [razvitiye] of delivery vehicles--ICBM's, cruise missiles, tactical missiles, aircraft and artillery.

Intensive development [razrabotka] of a new, "third generation" of nuclear ammunition is now taking place in the United States. The scale of this activity may be judged from foreign press reports. Work is being conducted for this purpose under 22 programs. Each one is for a separate type of ammunition. Tests of 10 types of such ammunition have been completed, and they are being put into full-scale production. They include warheads for the MX ICBM and the Pershing 2 medium-range ballistic missile, warheads for long-range sea-, air-, and land-based cruise missiles, a nuclear bomb for a strategic bomber, and a neutron warhead for a 203.2mm artillery shell. A further approximately 10 types of nuclear ammunition are going through the stage of active development [atrabotka] and testing. This category includes, in particular, a single warhead for the light Midgetman ICBM's, a warhead for the shipborne Standard 2 antiaircraft guided missile, a nuclear charge for a depth bomb, and warheads for submarine antiship missiles (of the Subroc type) and surface ship antisubmarine missiles (of the Asroc type).

Several of the latest types of nuclear ammunition are at the initial development [razrabotka] stage. They include ammunition earmarked for SDI. Proof of this is provided by the latest underground nuclear explosion carried out 28 November 1985 on a range in the American state of Nevada under the code name "George." A nuclear-powered X-ray laser was being tried out during that test, which was conducted within the framework of the "star wars" program.

It is perfectly obvious that the ending of nuclear tests would sharply limit the race for arms in this dangerous category and would objectively face the nuclear powers with the need to impart a practical nature to the whole process of nuclear disarmament.

It is no coincidence that this is opposed primarily by the U.S. military-industrial complex, which makes billions of dollars out of nuclear weapons. Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, one of the most zealous expressers of the interests of the military-industrial complex, demands that the United States be protected against any shifts of position on the key question of disarmament--the "Strategic Defense Initiative" and the nuclear tests so essential for realizing it.

The desire of certain U.S. circles to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union stands out in particularly great relief against the background of the USSR's constructive peace initiatives. Postwar history convincingly confirms that this is an illusory, unrealizable, but, at the same time, extremely dangerous path, which is a source of growing threat and tension.

Wishing to set an example of good will, the Soviet Union unilaterally ceased all nuclear explosions from 6 August 1985 through 1 January 1986 and urged the U.S. administration to subscribe to that moratorium. A mutual Soviet-U.S. moratorium would also serve as a good example to other states that possess nuclear weapons.

The United States has not yet accepted the Soviet proposal. While our moratorium was in effect, it carried out seven officially announced nuclear tests. You might think that, according to the logic of "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," the Soviet side, as of 1 January 1986, acquired all legitimate grounds for resuming nuclear tests. However, the Soviet Union did not do so. It made one more attempt to halt the process of military rivalry and extended the unilateral moratorium by 3 months. This moratorium will continue in effect if the United States in turn ceases nuclear tests.

Of course, the adoption of a unilateral moratorium is a far from simple matter. In order to introduce it, we had to cease tests in 1985. The extension of the moratorium by a further 3 months in 1986 will again disrupt the course of corresponding work. Meanwhile, the United States is continuing to improve nuclear weapons at full speed. And this in no way accords with the interests of resolving the central security questions which form the linchpin of Soviet-U.S. relations. Because the Soviet Union will not be able *ad infinitum* to display unilateral restraint in respect of nuclear tests.

The CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement states: "The possibility of halting the process of improving nuclear arms and developing [otrabotka] new such arms does exist. It must not be missed. The Soviet proposals place the USSR and the United States in an equal position. They make no attempt to outwit or beat the other side. We propose embarking on the path of sensible, responsible decisions."

The American Administration does not and cannot have any convincing reasons for moving further away from resolving the very urgent problem of ending nuclear tests. Various references, including references to the impossibility of effectively monitoring [kontrol] nuclear explosions, sound extremely unconvincing today. Above all, because the USSR and the United States possess highly sophisticated national technical means which make it possible to reliably record even very low-yield nuclear explosions.

The Soviet side also supported the idea of six states--Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden, and Greece--regarding the creation of an international monitoring [kontrol] machinery with the help of a system of special stations on their territories to observe the fulfillment of the accord on ending tests. Finally, the Soviet Union is prepared, provided a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions is established now, to reach agreement with the United States also on on-site verification [kontrol] measures to eliminate possible doubts as to the moratorium's observance.

For the speediest elaboration of a treaty on a universal nuclear weapon test ban the Soviet side proposes the resumption of the tripartite talks (the USSR, the United States, Britain).

To adopt the right decision on this question without delay means taking account of the insistent demand of all the world's peoples, the demand to preserve life on earth for future generations.

/8309  
CSO: 5200/1273

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### USSR URGES 'PRACTICAL STEP' BY U.S. ON ARMS TESTING

LD211639 Moscow TASS in English 1622 GMT 21 Feb 86

[text] Moscow, February 21 TASS - TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachenov writes:

The very fact of existence on earth of huge nuclear weapons arsenals is a source of an unprecedented threat to mankind. This threat will vastly increase when a part of those weapons of mass destruction gets under the control of people who believe it possible to juggle with nuclear bombs with the aims of political blackmail, and even, when "a favourable opportunity presents", to put them to use. In the present-day situation, when practically the whole population of the world is aware of the catastrophic consequences of any nuclear conflict, such, to put it mildly, irresponsible political leaders to do not dare, as a rule, to spell out in public their views on the problems of war.

The real stand of Washington's political leaders on nuclear war can be determined in the simplest possible manner by their attitude to the problem of nuclear weapons testing.

An end to nuclear testing cannot be detrimental either to the security of the United States, which, for that matter, has conducted more nuclear explosions than all other countries of the world combined, or the security of other countries. A ban on nuclear explosions will put an end to the creation of new and perfection of old mass destruction weapons. A ban, or for a start, a moratorium on explosions, will deplete nuclear weapons arsenals and make them truly obsolete.

Renunciation by all nuclear powers of the conducting of tests will considerably remove the threat of nuclear war, as even the most out-and-out adventurists will hardly risk to use untested and therefore, unpredictable, in their effects, weapons of an enormous yield.

Control over the observance of an agreement on ending nuclear explosions can no longer be used even as a pretext for rejecting a moratorium.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1273

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### TASS: 'NOTORIOUS' U.S. ARMS FORMULA SEEKS SUPERIORITY

LD221122 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 22 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

More and more Americans voice for the United States to join in the unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts announced by the U.S.S.R. At a press conference, held in Washington, prominent U.S. disarmament experts, members of the Arms Control Association, underlined that terminating the nuclear tests would better work to perfect nuclear armaments, including those which are being developed under the "star wars" programme. Paul Warnke, former director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, stated in this connection that the general line for bolstering U.S. security through building-up armaments rather than through treaty limitations is manifest in the U.S. refusal to terminate the nuclear tests.

Yes, the same notorious formula of the White House: to disarmament through building up the latest systems of mass destruction of people. Washington makes attempts to justify its stand by the "need" to modernize the U.S. nuclear potential. But the question arises, if the amount of weapons accumulated in the world today is enough to exterminate mankind many times over, why then go on increasing its stockpiles? There is no doubt that in steering this course the U.S. Administration is proceeding not towards disarmament but is after one and the same objective, namely, military superiority over the U.S.S.R. This is exactly the reason why U.S. leaders do not wish even to hear about the termination of the nuclear tests.

The Soviet Union is far from dramatizing the present situation, by characterising it as highly responsible, as a turning point. Mankind's destiny depends on what trend the developments will take. The moratorium on nuclear explosions is just the first concrete step in the right direction.

Striving to influence the other nuclear powers, above all the United States, by the strength of example, the Soviet Union went to extend its unilateral moratorium by another three months up to March 31. What was Washington's response to this step? The same threadbare arguments to justify a further build-up of its armaments. President Reagan said at one time that dancing a tango required two partners. So, the moratorium on nuclear tests is just the kind of tango to dance which without a partner makes no sense.

The Soviet Union has expressed readiness, in imposing a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions, that agreement be reached on the broadest verification measures, including on-site inspection.

The Soviet Union has already made an important step on the way towards complete ban on nuclear testing. Since August 6 last year, the USSR has unilaterally terminated all types of nuclear explosions. In January 1986, the Soviet Government extended that moratorium till March 31 and declared that it will remain in effect further if the USA ends its nuclear blasts.

Washington answered this highly important goodwill gesture of the Soviet Union with new nuclear weapons tests in the proving ground in Nevada. Following its distorted logic, the U.S. Administration said that it was ready to discuss an end to explosions only after its nuclear rearmament programmes were completed. The world could once again see for itself that the real aim of the U.S. Administration is not a halt to the arms race, but its uncontrolled buildup.

It was by no means a simple matter for the Soviet Union to take a decision on a unilateral halting of nuclear explosions. In face of Washington's intensive preparations for nuclear war, in conditions of the continuing American nuclear testing, the USSR cannot display unilateral restraint, including in the field of nuclear explosions, endlessly.

Washington has repeatedly expressed by word of mouth its readiness to "cover its mile on the way to disarmament". Yet, in actual fact, the current U.S. Administration has not made over the recent five years a single practical step which even with wild imagination could be evaluated as a glimpse of Washington's wish to curb the arms race.

Soviet people hope that common sense will yet prevail over Washington's ideological intolerance, over illusory calculations to ensure military superiority.

The closed circle, arms race--tensions--arms race, should be broken. To this end it is necessary that Washington agree, as its first step on the way of lowering the level of military confrontation, to follow the Soviet Union's example and announce a moratorium on nuclear explosions.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1273



## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S. CONDUCTING 'MINIATURIZED' NUCLEAR TESTS

PM211713 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Widespread Support"]

[Text] Tokyo, 21 Feb -- The United States is not only refusing to join the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, but is also conducting secret underground explosions in addition to those "officially acknowledged," according to the Japanese newspaper ASAHI.

Citing authoritative military experts, the newspaper reports that since the second half of the seventies the United States has been carrying out work to "miniaturize" nuclear weapon tests so as to make them virtually "imperceptible" to existing monitoring (kontroliruyushchiy) systems. According to figures from a private U.S. research organization, the council for the protection of natural resources, more than 10 "unofficial" underground nuclear explosions were carried out in the United States between 1980 and 1984 alone in addition to the "main" tests, which are usually officially announced.

As ASAHI points out, these explosions are being used in the creation (sozdaniye) of nuclear trigger devices for lasers, which the U.S. military is trying to use in the "star wars" program, and also in the development (razrabotka) of nuclear warheads for the latest U.S. Trident-2 missile systems.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1273

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: ANZUS 'DISINTEGRATING' DESPITE U.S. 'BRAZEN PRESSURE'

LD100043 Moscow TASS in English 0010 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, 29 Jan (TASS)--TASS political news analyst Boris Chekhonin writes:

The storm that broke out in Australia the other day over transparent hints of U.S. Congressman Samuel Stratton that it is high time New Zealand be expelled from ANZUS because of its anti-nuclear stand is not subsiding in countries of the Oceania. New Zealanders themselves are indignant at another act of Washington's crude pressure first of all for this means a new attempt by Washington to infringe on their national sovereignty and the right to decide what is good and what is bad for the country's security.

It is precisely by the interests of national security that New Zealand's government was motivated when submitting to parliament last year a draft law on banning the calls of foreign nuclear-armed warships into New Zealand's ports. Indeed, who can guarantee to New Zealand's people that U.S. nuclear ships, hiding in convenient harbours of the country's territorial waters will not deal a first unprovoked nuclear strike at the "enemy"? And if this happened, it is easy to see who would be in for a retaliation.

Added to this is another danger, more real for the present, the danger of a huge damage in case of failure of nuclear reactors or radioactive contamination as a result of some or other breakdowns. And the people of New Zealand realize this well. It is not for nothing that 77 percent of the polled recently declared in support of anti-nuclear legislation.

And if the legal aspect of the matter is considered, Wellington's decision has a legal basis. The text of the ANZUS treaty allows for the passage of nuclear-powered and nuclear-armed ships through the zone of the southern part of the Pacific. At the same time, it gives the right to separate countries to decide independently the question of admitting such warships into their ports. So there are actually no reasons for a political scandal inspired by Washington.

What does then explain Washington's brazen pressure? One cannot but agree with the opinion of well-informed observers: The U.S. Administration fears the possibility that New Zealand's anti-nuclear step might set off a chain reaction.

They on the banks of the Potomac reason that if events take such a turn, U.S. nuclear forces will be uncomfortable in other regions of the earth where peoples have long been waging a vigorous struggle to reject the dubious honour of being the United States nuclear hostages.

The consequences of anti-nuclear legislation submitted for the consideration of New Zealand's parliament alarm Washington also for the reason that the situation in the world is shaping not in favour of the nuclear arms race. The large-scale complex of the Soviet foreign policy initiatives advanced in the statement of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in January this year showed to humanity a real stage-by-stage way of general and complete nuclear disarmament by the end of this century.

On the whole, Washington's attempts to preserve ANZUS as it was look like whipping a dead horse. ANZUS is disintegrating and this is the sign of the times.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1273

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### IZVESTIYA EDITORIAL ARTICLE VIEWS U.S. ATTITUDE ON TEST BAN

PM221738 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "Washington at the 'Moment of Truth'; How the United States Is Responding to the Soviet Moratorium on Nuclear Explosions"]

[Text] The unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions has been in force for 7 months now. And the peoples have been waiting for Washington to join Moscow's initiative for 7 months.

But the United States increasingly does not deem it necessary to pool efforts with the Soviet Union in order to end nuclear explosions. Just what is preventing the United States from backing up in practice the widely proclaimed statements about its love of peace and ardent desire to save mankind from nuclear weapons? Washington has many answers to these questions.

"Answer" one. The USSR's decision to introduce a moratorium straight off without delay was called "propaganda." That assessment turned out to be inapplicable. Moscow proposed: "If everything we do is just seen as propaganda, why not respond to it along the lines of 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth'? We have stopped nuclear explosions. And you, Americans, should take revenge by doing the same." As revenge, however, there was another underground explosion in Nevada. It was followed by others. But since then there has been no mention of "propaganda." Preference is given to other "arguments."

"Answer" two. R. Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defense, stated last summer: "The Russians cannot be trusted. They have already violated a moratorium once." But the U.S. press reminded the untrusting "historian" that, to put it mildly, he was confused. Indeed, the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution 31 March 1958 on the unilateral ending of tests on all types of nuclear and hydrogen weapons and called for the other nuclear powers to follow this example.

The Soviet Union only released itself from this commitment 30 August 1958, some 4 months after Washington and London in response to the Soviet appeal had launched (in April that year) the most intensive nuclear test programs that had been held until then.

Things would seem to be clear. But time passes -- and in the second half of January 1986 L. Speakes, White House deputy press secretary, repeated Perle's pearls: "We are suspicious of Soviet moratoriums on tests because in the past the Russians have proposed moratoriums and broken them themselves." Is this obdurate ignorance or just deliberate slander? -- It is hard to say, but to all appearances, it is an "answer" that suits its authors.

"Answer" three. They try to make it easier to wander down paths of pseudohistoric excursions in the campaign against the moratorium by climbing on the old hobbyhorse of "verification [kontrol] difficulties." But that horse was worn out before it started. For Moscow proclaimed: "We state categorically that verification [kontrol] is no problem for us. If the United States ends all nuclear explosions on a reciprocal basis, the proper verification [kontrol] of the observance of the moratorium will be completely ensured by national technical means and with the help of international procedures -- with on-site inspections [inspektsiya] if necessary."

You cannot be clearer than that. However, time passes -- and at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, which recently resumed work, the U.S. delegation arrived with the same aim: "There are differing opinions on whether effective inspection [proverka] means exist." That is an old tune. And it is being played in the old style.

"Answer" four. Properly speaking, it is not one reply, but a whole series including the following "thesis": "The Soviet test program was basically complete at the end of that part of the year when they announced the introduction of their moratorium." This "argument" did not last long. The Soviet Union explained: "It was by no means easy for us to take this step. In order to introduce a unilateral moratorium it was necessary to break off the test program before it had been completed." But Washington got out of that also.

It was already January 1986. At one of his press conferences Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, not without malicious pleasure, rebuked Moscow: "They have prepared superbly for resuming tests on the day after the moratorium expires." That was said on virtually the same day that the Soviet Union stated: "We are extending our unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions by 3 months... The moratorium will stay in force if the United States, for its part, also ends nuclear tests."

Having familiarized himself with this decision, L. Speakes, White House deputy press secretary "understood" it himself -- and shared his discovery with journalists: "The Russians have the advantage and at the present moment do not need to hold tests." Gee, "those Russians"! They are slippery customers! They do not have to push ahead towards a conclusion of a strategic arms modernization by using nuclear explosions, thus building up the "Soviet threat" to United States which is at a disadvantage; they can just scoff -- they have the advantage and are prepared to wait a whole 8 months for the United States to catch up...

One excuse is more convincing than another. The chief of the U.S. military department even went so far as to declare: "The Russians do not hold tests at all at this time of year." Meaning that they wait until it gets warmer... But there are no grounds for rebuking C. Weinberger for his wild imagination. He himself obviously realized that trying to link the "start" and "end" of test programs is a thankless venture and so he switched to calculating "totals," as they say.

The results were not long in coming; soon the defense secretary declared: "The Russians have much more modern arms... They have held an enormous amount of tests."



To the uninitiated this answer may sound entirely convincing. But the initiated spend their time guessing: What amounts are we talking about? If we take the period between 1 January and 6 August 1985, it is common knowledge that the Soviet Union by no means outstripped the United States in terms of numbers of tests. If we take the entire postwar period, it turns out that the United States has held approximately 40 percent more nuclear tests than the Soviet Union, and 70 percent more when the other Western countries are included. So, if we copy the head of the U.S. military department and take the number of tests as a criterion of "threat" [ugrozhayemost], it is the West rather than the "Russians" which has far more "modern arms."

But a quantitative criterion is not the most reliable one in this specific case. Here facts of a different kind are far more trustworthy. And according to them (despite all of the Reagan administration's efforts to "steal a march" on the Soviet Union in its pursuit of indisputable military superiority and despite the U.S. Defense Department's vain attempts to portray the Soviet Union as "shooting far ahead"), the maintenance of rough parity in nuclear armaments between the two powers ensured by the Soviet Union has been and remains the reality. This was also confirmed in the Senate on 5 February by such an authoritative specialist as Admiral Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It is therefore not at all a question for the United States of the number of nuclear tests or nuclear armaments. What then is it?

Just a day after the promulgation of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's 15 January statement, THE WASHINGTON POST carried an article which said that "Officials have reported that the Reagan administration will not alter its position regarding the necessity of continuing tests." Why "necessity"? What precisely is it about the situation which forces Washington to talk of necessity when the Soviet Union in the self-same situation not only does not feel any "necessity," but indeed, approaches the question of nuclear tests from a position which is the exact opposite of that of the Americans?

Answering questions put by L'HUMANITE, M.S. Gorbachev described the Soviet program proposed in January for a world free of nuclear weapons as follows: "These proposals represent a kind of 'moment of truth.' They are making our negotiating partners reveal their true face and show what kind of goals their policy is really pursuing." What, then, does Washington's policy look like at this "moment of truth"?

As far as its attitude to the proposed Soviet moratorium is concerned, it is easy to see that the Washington administration does not, of course, have a single argument against joining the moratorium which convinces the peoples of the world.

Nor is it difficult to see another thing. Namely, that the United States, forced by the Soviet Union's comprehensive peace initiatives to confront the "moment of truth," is having to acknowledge the following with increasing frequency and candor: Yes, the renunciation of nuclear tests is undesirable for Washington, since it does not correspond to long-term U.S. arms.

The preparation of more and more new kinds and types of nuclear weapons with increasing lethality and destructiveness lies at the core of this "constellation" of goals. Washington's cherished "star wars" program is an organic element of those goals. If the United States renounced nuclear tests, it would be deprived of the opportunity of developing [razrabotki], testing, and deploying space strike armaments based on the principle of nuclear-triggered laser systems. And space weapons by themselves, as is now already obvious, are not only not intended to "eliminate nuclear arms," as the White House claims, but are designed to maintain them. After all, the elimination of nuclear arsenals by as early as the end of the present century, as the Soviet Union proposes, will make space systems simply unnecessary. Washington does not want to recognize this. But it is going to have to.

Submitting the draft Pentagon budget to the Congress, recently, the U.S. secretary of defense said: "The United States is at the present time beginning to act from a position of strength; it is in fact the only way to conduct talks effectively."

The chief of the military department does not yet, of course, represent the whole administration. But for some reason no refutations were heard of this infamous panegyric to the "position-of-strength policy." Nor were any attempts by the people to somehow dissociate themselves from the future course outlined by Weinberger recorded. Hence the question: How does this course square with R. Reagan's repudiation in Geneva of a desire to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union?

Analysis of the "arguments" presented to the world from the banks of the Potomac convincingly demonstrates that U.S. reluctance to join the moratorium on all nuclear tests declared and extended by the Soviet Union is nothing more than a manifestation of that desire: The desire to be capable of casting the peoples into the abyss of the very thermonuclear catastrophe to whose inadmissibility the White House today gladly gives verbal acknowledgment, while the Soviet Union is seeking to prevent it by deeds.

[This article is accompanied by a diagram containing information on "the number of nuclear explosions as of 1 January 1986" based on "data from the Swedish Defense Institute."

The diagram lists totals for five countries as follows: United States -- 789; USSR -- 565; France -- 135; Britain -- 38; China -- 29; Total -- 1,556. A pie chart follows which converts these figures into percentages: United States -- 50.4 percent; USSR -- 36 percent; France -- 8.6 percent; Britain 2.4 percent; China -- approximately 2 percent.

At the end of the diagram is the statement: "In 1985 the United States carried out 18 explosions. (prior to the moratorium the USSR and the United States each carried out 9 explosions)."

/8309

CSO: 5200/1271

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### MOSCOW ON NEW U.S. AMBASSADOR'S REMARKS ON NORDIC NFZ

LD240009 Moscow International Service in Finnish 1530 GMT 23 Jan 86

[Commentary by Aleksandr Gorbunov, TASS correspondent in Helsinki]

[Text] It has long been known that the complicated nature of the statements of a politician is directly comparable with their content. U.S. politicians and diplomats reject this view. Directly or indirectly they fail to hide their irritation when the topic of nuclear-free Scandinavia arises. In this sense Rockwell Schnabel, who assumes the post of U.S. ambassador to Finland in February, was no exception.

In an interview to an AAMULENTI correspondent in Washington he said that he disagreed with the Finns regarding nuclear-free Scandinavia. He explained the matter as follows: The United States supports the formation of nuclear-free zones in different parts of the world, as in South America, for instance. But in our view nuclear-free Scandinavia brings to nothing the deterrent factor which has been able to prevent the start of a new world war, and thus we do not support such a zone.

Let us now leave the deterrent factor to the diplomat's conscience. Let us look at another matter. The formation of nuclear-free Scandinavia is supported by the broad masses of Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Iceland, by political parties, youth organizations, trade unions, civic organizations and some governments and parliaments. A nuclear-free Scandinavia could become an important contribution to strengthening detente in Europe and to real disarmament, for which a specific and extensive program was recently presented by the Soviet Union. The United States showed once again to the public circles of Finland and the Nordic countries, that, contrary to the Soviet Union, it does not want to give guarantees of not using nuclear weapons against those Nordic countries that participate in such a zone, but that the United States opposes the practical application of Finland's important initiative. Proof of this is the interview with the U.S. diplomat.

In addition to this Washington is trying to force on the public of the Nordic countries its own version of the exceptionally peaceful nature of the SDI of the U.S. Administration. Rockwell Schnabel said in his interview to AAMULENTI that it is a system that destroys weapons and not people, and that the United States

is seeking an opportunity to render nuclear weapons unnecessary and is continuing research in this sphere. Of course, no one knows anything about the final results of this research. But if there is even the slightest possibility of rendering nuclear weapons obsolete and useless, then it is the duty of the United States, in Schnabel's view, in front of its own people and the world, to make use of this possibility.

While the peoples and most politicians of various countries welcome Mikhail Gorbachev's peace initiatives, Washington has sent to Finland to support its ambassador a delegation led by Assistant Secretary of State [as heard] Allen Holmes. The delegation includes experts from the U.S. State and Defense Departments and the National Security Council. The aim of the visit, arranged hurriedly at the request of the U.S. side, is according to HELSINGIN SANOMAT, to give Finnish citizens and authorities more detailed information about the star war plans. The United States has not given up its attempts to exert pressure on Finland in the question of nuclear-free Scandinavia and the question of creating, testing and deploying space strike weapons, the TASS correspondent notes in conclusion.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1273

## RELATED ISSUES

### CANADIAN COMMONS COMMITTEE ISSUES REPORT ON NORAD RENEWAL

Toronto THE SATURDAY STAR in English 15 Feb 86 pp A1, A4

[Article by Joe O'Donnell]

[Text] OTTAWA — Despite a deep split among its members, a parliamentary committee has recommended that the federal government renew its major air defence agreement with the United States virtually unchanged.

Progressive Conservative members — who form a majority on the committee — yesterday urged renewal of the 1981 agreement covering the North American Aerospace Defence Command (NORAD). But opposition MPs issued dissenting reports.

The Tories played down concerns about the agreement linking Canada to the Americans' controversial Star Wars project.

The majority report said that in five years, when the next renewal of the NORAD agreement is required, U.S. research into Star Wars may force Canada to reassess terms of the defence pact.

But "for the next five years, the pact will remain a reasonably sure guide to the future," it added.

#### 'Back door'

The opposition MPs said the agreement could provide a "back door" for Canadian participation in Star Wars, the U.S. space-based defence system.

As well, they said, Canada's refusal to participate in Star Wars — or any other scheme designed for anti-ballistic missile defence — must be clearly spelled out in the new defence pact.

The minority Liberals and New Democrats on the committee demanded in their dissenting reports that a clause dropped from the

1981 agreement be re-inserted immediately. It states that NORAD cannot get involved in anti-ballistic missile defence.

"If it (the clause) is in the contractual agreement, they (the U.S.) will not be able to act and drag us into there (Star Wars)," said Jean Chretien, the Liberal external affairs critic.

It was not an issue when it was dropped in 1981, Chretien noted, but circumstances have changed, largely because of the U.S. government's \$25 billion research program on Star Wars, known formally as the Strategic Defence Initiative.

#### Ignored opponents

The federal government has refused to get involved in Star Wars research but imposed no ban on private-sector participation.

Chretien said the controversial clause would be "assurance to us that through the NORAD agreement, we will not get into Star Wars through the back door."

Pauline Jewett, external affairs



critic for the New Democratic Party, said it was clear that Conservatives on the committee "did not really listen to the people out there who are really worried that (a new agreement) will be the Trojan Horse for involving us in Star Wars."

She said evidence already exists of breaches by the U.S. of anti-ballistic missile agreements that "will accelerate during the '80s."

The NDP, in its minority report, also called for renewal of the treaty in just two years. Liberals agreed with the five-year renewal period, but with negotiations for renewal starting one year before the deadline.

The NORAD agreement, first signed in 1958, usually calls for renewal every five years. The deadline set when it was last renewed in 1981 was May, 1986.

But it is expected to be signed earlier than May, likely next month in Washington when Prime Minister Brian Mulroney meets with President Ronald Reagan for their bilateral summit.

Associate Defence Minister Harvie Andre said he expects the government will adopt the majority recommendations in the report.

#### **Move unnecessary**

In the report, the Tories said there is no need for a shorter renewal period, or for reinstatement of the anti-ballistic missile clause, since Star Wars is beyond the jurisdiction of NORAD.

The majority report also recommended:

☐ That Canada accept a U.S. invitation to participate in the "conceptual planning exercise" known as SDA 2000. SDA 2000 is planning for the use of space or land-based, anti-missile systems that could be developed if the multi-billion-dollar, Star Wars research proves out;

☐ Ottawa begin a military space program for satellite surveillance of Canadian airspace, search and rescue and arms control verification;

☐ Canada consider negotiating a joint defence agreement with the U.S. covering the Arctic Ocean that would involve underwater listening devices and other means of detecting submarines.

Conservative committee chairman William Winegard, at a news conference following the release of the report in the House of Commons, said he acknowledges concerns among Canadians over Star Wars, which he vaguely described as "shadows on the road ahead."

But deployment of Star Wars is so far down the road that it is not necessary for the government to incorporate those concerns now into the NORAD pact.

The committee did make one recommendation to pacify critics by urging the government to make a joint declaration with the U.S. in support of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty between the superpowers. That treaty limits the testing and deployment of defences against long-range missiles.

However, it would not be in the formal NORAD agreement.

Representatives of disarmament groups across Canada, in Ottawa yesterday for the release of the report, insisted that such a declaration, unless it is formally incorporated into the NORAD treaty, is useless.

"That is hardly a guarantee of anything," complained Steve Shallhorn, spokesman for the Toronto Disarmament Network, representing more than 80 disarmament groups in Metro.

He said the committee report "keeps the door open to Star Wars and is a slap in the face to the peace movement."

Simon Rosenblum, spokesman for Project Ploughshares, said the report proves the Mulroney government is "soft on Star Wars," despite its declarations to the contrary.

Shallhorn said disarmament groups in Metro will be meeting during the weekend to discuss strategy in determining ways to rally public opposition to the committee's key recommendations.

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

**19 MAR 86**